

Middlesex University Research Repository

An open access repository of

Middlesex University research

<http://eprints.mdx.ac.uk>

Ozokoli, Gabriel Nduaguba (1989) The changing role of the school inspector and advisor in England and Wales : a case study of a London suburban authority. Masters thesis, Middlesex Polytechnic. [Thesis]

This version is available at: <https://eprints.mdx.ac.uk/13465/>

Copyright:

Middlesex University Research Repository makes the University's research available electronically.

Copyright and moral rights to this work are retained by the author and/or other copyright owners unless otherwise stated. The work is supplied on the understanding that any use for commercial gain is strictly forbidden. A copy may be downloaded for personal, non-commercial, research or study without prior permission and without charge.

Works, including theses and research projects, may not be reproduced in any format or medium, or extensive quotations taken from them, or their content changed in any way, without first obtaining permission in writing from the copyright holder(s). They may not be sold or exploited commercially in any format or medium without the prior written permission of the copyright holder(s).

Full bibliographic details must be given when referring to, or quoting from full items including the author's name, the title of the work, publication details where relevant (place, publisher, date), pagination, and for theses or dissertations the awarding institution, the degree type awarded, and the date of the award.

If you believe that any material held in the repository infringes copyright law, please contact the Repository Team at Middlesex University via the following email address:

eprints@mdx.ac.uk

The item will be removed from the repository while any claim is being investigated.

See also repository copyright: re-use policy: <http://eprints.mdx.ac.uk/policies.html#copy>

Middlesex University Research Repository:

an open access repository of
Middlesex University research

<http://eprints.mdx.ac.uk>

Ozokoli, Gabriel Nduaguba, 1989.
The changing role of the school inspector and advisor in England and
Wales.
Available from Middlesex University's Research Repository.

Copyright:

Middlesex University Research Repository makes the University's research available electronically.

Copyright and moral rights to this thesis/research project are retained by the author and/or other copyright owners. The work is supplied on the understanding that any use for commercial gain is strictly forbidden. A copy may be downloaded for personal, non-commercial, research or study without prior permission and without charge. Any use of the thesis/research project for private study or research must be properly acknowledged with reference to the work's full bibliographic details.

This thesis/research project may not be reproduced in any format or medium, or extensive quotations taken from it, or its content changed in any way, without first obtaining permission in writing from the copyright holder(s).

If you believe that any material held in the repository infringes copyright law, please contact the Repository Team at Middlesex University via the following email address:
eprints@mdx.ac.uk

The item will be removed from the repository while any claim is being investigated.

THE CHANGING ROLE OF THE SCHOOL INSPECTOR AND ADVISER
IN ENGLAND AND WALES

A Case Study of a London Suburban Authority

being a Dissertation submitted in partial fulfilment of
the requirements for the Degree of

MASTER OF PHILOSOPHY

in Middlesex Polytechnic

by

GABRIEL NDUAGUBA OZOKOLI
B.A.; M.A. (Dublin), M.Ed. (Hull)

August, 1989

AN ABSTRACT OF THESIS FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF PHILOSOPHY

BY GABRIEL OZOKOLI, ENTITLED: THE CHANGING ROLE OF THE SCHOOL

INSPECTOR AND ADVISER IN ENGLAND AND WALES

The aim of this thesis is to investigate and evaluate the role of the school local authority inspector and adviser. The study is in two parts. The first outlines aspects of the historical development of the school inspector's role. The second comprises an investigation into the changing role of the local authority school inspector and sources of role conflicts which previous researchers have shown to exist. Participant observations and research interview methods were used to obtain the opinions of the respondents. The main conclusions of the study were: 1. In the opinions of the majority of the respondents, the inspector and adviser should attach a high degree of importance to the items of the activities in the following order of priority: first, activity (2), Advising individual staff on personal and professional matters; second, activity (5) Informal inspection of schools; third, activity (17) Disseminating the best practices from one school to another; fourth, activity (18) Report Writing; fifth, activity (19) Dealing with correspondence. 2. The inspector or adviser is expected to advise and inspect teachers. These are the main changing roles or expectations of the inspector or adviser. 3. The inspectors' and advisers' conceptions were convergent with regard to the following activities:- Activity (17) Disseminating the best practices from one school to another; activity (2) Advising individual staff on personal and professional matters; activity (5) Informal inspection of schools. 4. The inspectors and advisers conceptions were divergent on activities: (3) Evaluation of teachers; (4) Formal inspection of schools; (15) Observing teachers in their classes. 5. It is suggested that those activities on which their conceptions were divergent constituted sources of role conflicts and role strain for the inspectors and advisers. 6. The inspector's and adviser's role overload and role stress could be alleviated by means of delegation of responsibility of authority. 7. The inspector's or adviser's role depends very much on the expectations which he perceived that members of his role-set hold of his role. The most important of these are his immediate superiors: the chief inspector, the director of education and headteachers and teachers. 8. As schools respond to increasing pressures, inspection is changing. Schools are becoming more formal organisations and are resorting to more management systems. Inspectors and advisers are becoming more closely identified with management positions as planners, monitors, evaluators, experimenters and teacher educators. Such radical departures from the roles previously performed by many inspectors and advisers will require considerable modifications in knowledge and skills. Yet, since inspector's and adviser's aim is the improvement of instructions, present conditions require such a changing role.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This thesis would not have been written without the help of many people. I would like to express my sincere thanks to the following: to Dr. Peter Sneddon for his supervision, constructive criticism and his help with the computer programming and data processing; to Colin Brock for his supervision, guidance and encouragement; to Dr. L.M. Shaw for her invaluable help during the early stages of the project before she left for Canada.

An essential factor in carrying out the study was the willing co-operation of the school inspectors and advisers who endured my frequent request for interviews and participant observation. I am especially grateful to them. Grateful appreciation is due to those headteachers and teachers who were kind enough to spare their time for this study which would not have been possible without their co-operation.

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Acknowledgements	i
Table of Contents	ii
Abbreviations	v
Introduction	vi

<u>CHAPTER ONE:</u>	<u>A HISTORY OF LOCAL EDUCATION AUTHORITY SCHOOL INSPECTORS AND ADVISERS IN ENGLAND FROM 1870-1988</u>	1
1.1	Introduction	1
1.2	The 1870 Education Act	1
1.3	Inspection by School Boards	5
1.4	Board Inspectors and Advisers	8
1.5	Excerpts from Examination and Inspection of Schools	20
1.6	Inspecting Secondary Schools	23
1.7	The Blue Books: Suggestions for Teachers	24
1.8	Since 1944	29
1.9	The Role of Inspectors and Advisers	32
1.10	The Structure and Size of an Inspectorial Team	36
1.11	Advisers and Administrators	39
1.12	Advisers and Teachers	42

<u>CHAPTER TWO:</u>	<u>THE HISTORY OF EDUCATION IN MIDDLEHAM: 1870-1988</u>	51
2.1	Old Middleham: The Setting for the Development of Educational Services	51
2.2	Middleham School Board	52

	<u>Page</u>
<u>CHAPTER TWO: (Continued)</u>	
2.3 Appointment of an Officer or Officers to Enforce Attendance at School	55
2.4 Education in Middleham	55
2.5 After the 1902 Act	60
<u>CHAPTER THREE:</u>	
<u>RESEARCH, RATIONALE AND METHODOLOGY</u>	63
3.1 The Context: Middleham Today	63
3.2 Employment in Middleham	64
3.3 Middleham School Board Inspectorate	66
3.4 The Core Curriculum	67
3.5 Inspectorial Roles in the Middleham Reform	70
3.6 The Methodology of Participant Observation	79
3.7 Types of Information	91
3.8 Sampling	91
3.9 Establishing Field Relations	96
3.10 The Research Model for Middleham	99
3.11 The Observation Stage	103
3.12 The Interview Stage	105
3.13 Time Spent Scale	106
<u>CHAPTER FOUR:</u>	
<u>RESEARCH FINDINGS</u>	111
4.1 Introduction	111
4.2 Activity 1: Advising or Participating in the Appointment of Staff to Schools	119
4.3 Activity 2: Advising Individual Staff about Personal or Professional Matters	121

	<u>Page</u>
<u>CHAPTER FOUR:</u> (Continued)	
4.4 Activity 3: Evaluation and Career Development of Individual Staff	123
4.5 Activity 4: Formal Inspection of Schools or Colleges	125
4.6 Activity 5: Informal Inspection of Schools or Colleges	127
4.7 Activity 6: Visiting Schools to Diagnose their Problems and Needs	128
4.8 Activity 7: Visiting Schools to Discuss the Problems and Needs which they have Diagnosed and to indicate their solution	129
4.9 Activity 8: In-Service Education and Training of Teachers	130
4.10 Activity 9: Curriculum Development	131
4.11 Activity 10: Advising Education Committees on Policy Changes in Schools and Colleges	132
4.12 Activity 11: Advising Schools and Colleges on Policy Changes made by the Education Committees	134
4.13 Activity 12: Attending School Inspectors' Meetings	135
4.14 Activity 13: Attending Education Committee Meetings	136
4.15 Activity 14: Advising Individual Head Teachers	137
4.16 Activity 15: Observing Teachers in their Classes	138
4.17 Activity 16: Advising Individual Teachers	139
4.18 Activity 17: Disseminating the Best Practices from One School or College to Another. Arranging for Direct Contact and Visits between their staff	140
4.19 Activity 18: Report Writing	141
4.20 Activity 19: Dealing with Correspondence	142

	<u>Page</u>
<u>CHAPTER FOUR:</u> (Continued)	
4.21 Activity 20: Advising on Furnishing and Design of Schools or Colleges	144
4.22 Activity 21: Working with Teachers' Centre Staff	145
4.23 Activity 22: Contact with Her Majesty's Inspectors	146
4.24 Order of Importance	147
4.25 Overall Priorities	148
4.26 Research Findings in Rank Order	149
 <u>CHAPTER FIVE:</u> <u>SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS</u>	 152
5.1 Summary of Findings from the Middleham Study	152
5.2 Discussion and Conclusion: A Comparison of the Historical and Contemporary View of the Role of the Local Authority Inspector	161
5.3 Conclusions and Recommendations	171
5.4 Suggestions for Further Research	182
 <u>APPENDICES</u>	 186
 <u>BIBLIOGRAPHY</u>	 199

ABBREVIATIONS

LEA Inspector : Inspectors are LEA officers, but at least three definitions of who should be included in this group are possible. Any LEA officer who carries out advisory type duties such as inspector, adviser, and advisory teacher.

Inspector and adviser are used inter-changeably in this study. Both perform the same functions.

AEO	Assistant education officer.
CEO	Chief education officer.
DES	Department of Education and Science.
HMI	Her Majesty's Inspectorate.
HMSO	Her Majesty's stationery office.
INSET	In-service education and training.
LEA	Local education authority.
NAHT	National Association of Head Teachers.
NAIEA	National Association of Inspectors Ed. Ad.
NAIEO	National Association of Inspectors Ed. Org.
NAS	National Association of School Masters.
NUT	National Union of Teachers.

INTRODUCTION

Despite a considerable body of speculative and scientific writings on leadership role, its meaning, its determinants and its effect, the knowledge of the nature and correlates of leadership roles in school organisations remains quite limited. Through an examination of the school inspector's roles, it is hoped to contribute the knowledge about the effects and determinants of professional leadership role in schools. The school inspector and adviser have great potentialities for influencing directly and indirectly the type and quality of education pupils receive in schools. They are the school officials in constant contact with headteachers and teachers, as well as with the central functions of schools: teaching and learning. Their positions as school leaders provide them with the opportunity to motivate their teachers and to help them to improve their standard and performance in teaching. They can inspect their schools and offer their teachers valuable advice about classroom problems. They can organise and conduct in-service courses for teachers. They can maximise different skills in their teachers, and help them grow in competence. The school inspector and adviser have substantial opportunities to provide a high order of leadership role to their teachers.

The conception of the school inspector's role as school leader permeates social science literature. Their efforts to conform to this conception of their roles constitute the focal point of this study. To what extent do the inspector and adviser attempt to offer professional leadership roles to their schools? Is it myth or reality that the degree to which the inspector and adviser attempt to provide

professional leadership roles to their schools has a favourable effect upon the teachers' morale, teachers' performance and pupils' learning?

If the inspector's and adviser's roles do have any of these effects, what accounts for their variability? Does age, or sex or experience make a difference in their roles? Does the type of training for their job influence their professional leadership roles in schools? Are other facets of their roles related to their functions?

a) Background to the study

The study of the changing role of the LEA inspector and adviser arose from this researcher's pieces of research work. The first was Ozokoli (1974) at Trinity College, University of Dublin, which was concerned with the role of the teacher; the second was Ozokoli (1976) at the University of Manchester College of Education, which was about methods of teaching in colleges of education in England; the third was Ozokoli (1978) at the University of Hull, Institute of Education, which was about the role of the headteacher. One of the main outcomes of these studies was a proposal for this project.

b) Statement of the problem

Inspectors and advisers have many roles. One inspector described his three broad priorities. First, he did what he was specifically asked to do from above; second, he did what he himself had identified as being important; finally, in the time left he tackled improvements and developments. To this inspector and others

like him, the very diffuseness of their task, its lack of definition and the range of different areas and directions in which their time could be used increases its interest as the chosen occupation. To others, it presents an unending prospect of frustration through the difficulty of not devoting sufficient time to any one concern. These possibilities are reflected in the problem of this researcher. For example, should he try to cover the whole range of inspectorial roles knowing that he must do so superficially or should he concentrate on one aspect in the hope of gaining a better understanding of the role. The latter decision was chosen for this study, with its particular emphasis on time spent on various aspects of the role.

c) Conflicting role

The changing role of the school inspectorate has exposed some conflict in the inspector's role. The inspector is the teacher's adviser, yet he should inspect them. Could these two functions be successfully combined in one person? At the conference of school inspectors in Chichester, England, Professor Joseph Lauwerys answered the question in the negative and suggested that more and more it would become necessary for the two functions of advice on one hand, and administrative control on the other, to be performed by different persons.¹ Louis Francois, on the other hand, maintained that one person could successfully carry through the dual role.² Here is an important conflict in the school inspector's role. The conflict arises on the authority which the inspector exercises over the appointment and promotion of teachers.

Against this view, it would appear that the power of the inspectorate over the appointment and promotion of teachers has been accepted without question. There is a wide difference of emphasis on the importance of the problem. Value judgement on the issues is entirely out of place; but the issues are worthy of further research. ³

d) Purpose of the Study

The aim of this thesis was to investigate and analyse the conceptions of inspectors and advisers for the role of the school inspector. The study was in two parts. Part One outlined various approaches to the school inspector's role and analysed some important concepts such as role, school as an organisation, power and authority in school, and effective leadership role in school. Part One also contained the evolution of the school inspectorate in England and Wales; the international perspectives: thus, there was the role of the inspectorate in France; there was the Canadian project in school leadership, and the changing role of the inspectorate in Nigeria. In Part Two, an investigation was made into the changing role of the school inspector and adviser, which previous research has shown to exist. The participant observations and research interview methods were used to obtain the opinions of the respondents. This study aimed at discovering what expectations inspectors and advisers hold of the school inspector's role. In what respects did their conceptions converge towards one another, in what respects did they diverge from one another? From the implications of the results of the investigation, some viable suggestions and conclusions were drawn.

e) Importance of the study

There is a need for research in this area of educational establishment and such need is significant because this area has not been explored in this light by previous researchers.

Bolam et al (1978) stated that there is urgent need for action research in evaluating performance and standards in schools...that their research project was hampered from the outset by lack of reliable information about school inspectors and advisers ... that the main gap in their research studies is the perceptions of advisers and inspectors' roles as held by headteachers and teachers. They recommended that a survey of them be carried out. They also expressed the need for further research on the perceptions of the role of advisers and inspectors as held by themselves as well as expectations for their own roles. They observed that very little research has been done on the evaluation and development of advisory and inspectorial services, and suggested that such studies should be based upon a single local education authority or upon the work of particular advisers or inspectors in particular subjects.

Professor Morgan contends that the status and roles of school inspectors and advisers are inadequate because their functions are uncertain; that strengthening their roles by defining them is essential to the defence of educational value ... that members of the school inspectorate suffer from uncertainty and role conflicts which weaken their effectiveness.

The National Association of School Inspectors and Educational Advisers and Organisers (NAIEO) Journal (1979) stated that certain aspects of advisers' roles ought to be researched in order to find causes and provide remedies ... that it is insufficient to say that school standards have not fallen and as members of the association, we must be seen to be actively involved in their maintenance and improvement ... that for many colleagues the inspection element is anathema but as quality control agents we cannot overlook it ... that the solution lies in research surveys to monitor progress and identify deficiency and needs ... that the dominant roles must be to correct faults and activate growth points.

f) Limitation of the study

Three other features of the study ought to be stated. First, the views of headteachers and teachers were not studied. It is recognised that these are of great importance and some recommendations have been made about them. Second, as far as possible, the anonymity of both inspectors and their LEAs has been preserved. During observation and interviews, it was made clear that such anonymity was a sine qua non of the project. It was understood that those concerned were sensitive about possible criticism.

g) Methodology

The purpose in this section was to explore the school inspector's perception of time spent on some activities of his role. It was decided to employ the research methodology of participant observation. This allows the researcher to get closer to the quality of

data. One study emphasises direct observation: another stresses informant interviewing; another leans most heavily upon respondent interviewing, yet another on document analysis and respondent interviewing as well as on direct participation. But in virtually every case, all the five techniques were employed in some varying proportion. The relative role which each plays in a given study depends not only on the personal preferences of the researcher, but on the type of data for which each is best suited.

Data for this study were collected from the following sources:

(i) Direct observation. This is the archtypical technique of scientific inquiry. If one seeks to know and understand what exists or what is happening, the commonsense impulse is to go and look at it closely and repeatedly.

(ii) Informant interviewing is the technique chosen to seek information on events that occur infrequently or are not open to direct observation.

(iii) Respondent interviewing is employed where the information sought concerns the personal feelings, perceptions, motives or intentions of the interviewees. Here it is the person rather than events that is of interest to the researcher.

(iv) Document analysis: certain documents such as official statistics and reports are used like informants to establish facts about events which the researcher was unable to observe directly.

(v) Direct participation in the events under study is a very heuristic technique. Data obtained by direct participation are verified by observing or interviewing other relevant factors.

h) Role definition

Role refers to behaviour. Walter Contu⁶ defines role as a socially prescribed way of behaving in particular situations for any person occupying a given social position or status. Thus, the study of an inspector's role performance is that in which his actual behaviour is observed. Role also refers to expectations of behaviour. Gross, Mason and McEachern⁷ define an expectation as constituting a force exerted upon a person by significant others or referent groups. Thus, studies of inspectors' role expectations are those in which expectations maintained for them by themselves and by their head-teachers and teachers and others are investigated. Brookover presents a paradigm to show that an actor's behaviour in a given role is determined through a process of interaction between his self-involvement in the role, and his definition of what he thinks others expect of him in it. Moser states that roles are defined in terms of expectations. These he described as certain normative obligations and responsibilities which attach to a role. He maintains that expectations define for an actor what he should or should not do as long as he is incumbent of that particular role.

Linton deals with role consensus and provides a basis for an

"ideal" or highly desirable pattern of behaviour for some positions or status. Although he recognises variability in a behaviour of position incumbents, he assumes that there is consensus among the members of a society on the behaviour expected of people in focal positions. This behaviour he terms an ideal pattern.

Guskin and Guskin treat role expectations and perceptions as the two main components of behaviour. They state that role perception attempts to explain behaviour by noting how a person's actions are derived from his social position and from the obligations and privileges of his position; that expectations may be as explicit as a job description or as informal and implicit as the desires that parents hold for their children. They maintain that what is important is the role theory's assumption that social expectations control the actions of individuals in a given position in such a way as the film script controls the performance of actors in a given role.

The problem of role definition has to be considered from three main points:

(i) From the point of view of role expectations emanating from the role set which seek to guide and prescribe the behaviour of a position.

(ii) From individual's own definition of his role expectation; that is, what he personally and ideally thinks he ought to do.

(iii) There is the actual role performance or observed behaviour resulting from the interaction of role demands and individual role conception and the characteristics of his own personality.

i) Role conflict

Gross, Mason and McEachern (1958)⁸ found that superintendents of schools were faced with role conflict or conflicting expectations from parents, teachers and school boards.

Burham (1964) discovered that headteachers and teachers were perceived as holding contradictory expectation for the deputy head's role. These studies show that the concept of role is further complicated by the fact that what counts is not what teachers or parents or school boards they expect that matters, but what the inspectors perceive them to be expecting - a fact which is at the bottom of many misunderstandings that often occur in organisations. It is at this point also that the possibility exists of perceptual seduction in that factors such as power, status, affiliation and threat of sanction loom large.

j) Contribution to knowledge

The final broad features of this study were: first, its exploratory nature. It focussed on the role of important groups of educationists who have not been systematically researched. Therefore, this study is in many respects a mapping out of an unexplored field. It also aimed to shed some light on ways in which inspectors may contribute more effectively to the improvement of schools. Secondly, the original contribution in the thesis is in the empirical sections. The historical sections are presented as necessary background to interpret the empirical part of the study, rather than being original in themselves.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. Professor Joseph Lauwerys was the chairman of the School Inspector's conference at Bishop Otter College, Chichester, England from April 14th to 22nd, 1955 from 29 countries.
2. Louis Francis was the General Inspector of School, a representative from France.
3. Ben Morris, chairman of N.E.F. International Conference for Inspectors of Schools, Chichester, England, 1955.
4. Gross, N., Mason, W.S. and McEachran, A. (1958), Explorations in Role Analysis: Studies of the School Superintendency Role, New York, Wiley.
5. Burnham, P.S., The Role of the Deputy Head in Secondary Schools (Unpublished M.Ed. thesis, Leicester University, 1964).
6. Contu, M., 'Role: A Redundant Concept in Sociology? Some Educational Considerations, in Role, (Sociological Studies 4)', ed. Jackson, J.A. (Cambridge Univ. Press, 1972), pp.107-28.
7. Gross, et al, (1958), op.cit., p.108.
8. ibid, p.109.
9. Bolam, R., Smith, G., and Canter, H., LEA Advisers and the Mechanism of Innovation (1975), NFER Publishing Co.
10. ibid, p.239.

11. Professor Morgan, Times Educational correspondent (1979).
12. The National Association of School Inspectors' and Education Advisers' Journal (1982).

CHAPTER ONE

A HISTORY OF LOCAL EDUCATION AUTHORITY SCHOOL INSPECTORS AND ADVISERS IN ENGLAND FROM 1870-1988

1.1 Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to trace the development of the local authority school inspectors and advisers from 1870 Elementary Education Act to 1988. It is clear that an historical account of such development is a necessary contribution to a knowledge of the role expectancies held for the school inspectors and advisers. This information is thought to be useful to those concerned with training programmes in curriculum leadership and the modus operandi of persons working in inspectorial and advisory positions.

1.2 The 1870 Education Act

The Elementary Education Act of 1870 introduced a new conception for England of the function of state in national education. The position before its passing was adequately described by the Chancellor of Exchequer, Robert Lowe when he said:

"At present, we have really no public education at all - what is called public education is merely the humble and ancillary task of following private benevolence and societies which interest themselves to educate the people." ¹

Not that there was much evidence of bold leadership in the Act which finally emerged. Denominational rivalry and financial stringency combined to force compromises upon the government with the result that the Act seemed an attempt to support the status quo, rather than to solve the problem of public education. Nonetheless, the Act was a clear reform which led to a considerable enlargement of the State's responsibility for education. "This was reflected inter alia in the work of inspectors and advisers which from 1870 adapted itself to fulfil a broader role." ² By 1870, about 40% of the nation's children were not attending school of any kind, largely because there were no schools for them to attend. The twin ideas behind the Elementary Education Act of 1870 were that a local rate should be levied to provide local elementary education where none existed, or was insufficient, and that an ad hoc local body should have control over the spending of the education rate. By 1902, there were no fewer than 2,214 such school boards in England. They varied enormously in size and efficiency." ³ Month by month, these boards recorded carefully all their transactions and regulated their proceedings according to the Third Schedule of the Act of 1870. Their motives were the educational welfare of the poor. They had their critics and their defenders, notably among the latter was Professor Huxley. ⁴

The tasks facing the new town school boards were many. The scope of their problems is seen in the monthly minutes and agenda. The bigger boards had first to estimate how many children should be

attending school and how many places there were for them. Thus, one of the board's census revealed 48,787 children needing places with only 27,329 places available. Other duties developed through the Management Committee. For example, teaching posts had to be advertised and candidates interviewed on short lists. Salary scales have to be drawn up for both teaching and non-teaching staff, and also lists of duties. The other large committee was usually the Attendance Committee. As board schools depended for maintenance on government grants besides rate aid and as one third of the government grant was for attendance, the boards were at pains to include the school-going habits among the dirty infantry of the streets. Bye-laws were drafted very early on and school managers encouraged to go into the schools to check registers. Large boards appointed school attendance officers - better known as 'kid catchers'. The scheme of education for the control of schools of Middleham Board in 1873 included the following resolutions:-

- (1) That every board school shall be conducted in compliance with the regulations of the Education Department for gaining annual grants.
- (2) That the schools of the board shall be under the direct management of the board through the education and management of the school committee.
- (3) In order to provide for the complete supervision of schools in addition to official visitation, there shall be appointed visitors for the schools.

(4) For this purpose, the schools shall be grouped or otherwise on the recommendation of the committee or the board who are willing to undertake the duty, and such persons not being more than three for each school or group, as may be approved by the board.

(5) The schools shall be visited from time to time and there shall be kept in each school a book in which records of visits and recommendations shall be made, having reference to the entire management of the schools, including premises, fittings, instructions, teachers, cleaning and evening schools.

(6) The visitors' books shall be brought before the committee in such order as the committee may direct and the recommendations and notes considered.

The blend of administrative and educational supervision was apparent from the questions visitors had to answer.

"Visitor's book:

.....School
.....Department

Questions:

- 1. Name and address of visitor.
- 2. Date and hour of visit.
- 3. Is the attendance of teachers regular and punctual?
- 4. Is the staff complete and efficient?

5. Are the pupil teachers regularly instructed?
6. Is the timetable duly observed?
7. Do you observe any defect of discipline or organisation in the schools?
8. Is the average attendance satisfactory?
9. Are the books appointed to be kept by the teachers in order and entries duly made?
10. Are the schools and classrooms cleaned and well warmed and ventilated?
11. Is the caretaker attentive to his duties?
12. Is the condition of the playground satisfactory?
13.Signature of visitor." 5

So schemes of general visitation were evolved but as two-thirds of the government grant was dependent on the result of examinations under the still flourishing Revised Code, the emergence of more definite local education authority inspection was only to be expected.

1.3 Inspection by School Boards

London led the way, appointing the first local education authority inspector in January 1872. At first, the duties of the London Management Committee had been defined as being:

"To deal with all business relating to the management and discipline of the board schools and to the instruction given to them.

To consider and report to the Board upon the appointment and removal of managers and teachers, and upon the fees to be paid by scholars; in all matters in relation to industrial schools, to superintend the industrial school officers, and to administer the Bye-laws relating to compulsory and appoint one or more sub-committees to deal with several parts of its business." 6

The School Management Committee's first task was to determine what should be the nature of its administrative relationship to schools. By the School Management minutes of 18 October 1871, it recommended in relation to four schools:

"That the clerk be instructed to write and say that the Board are about to appoint a body of eight managers under Section 15 of the Elementary Education Act 1870; that four new managers would be nominated by the existing body for appointment by the Board and four would be appointed directly by the Board." 7

On the 1 May 1872, when a second board school inspector had just been appointed, the Board showed signs of amending this policy. It moved:

"That in future, no managers be appointed for new schools established by the Board, but that the schools shall be managed by the inspectors who shall visit each school periodically at the discretion of the School Management Committee to consider what additional staff of inspectors will be required." 8

that it be referred to the Finance Committee to consider whether, in the interests of these schools, the payments for salaries and other expenses cannot be made by cheques made payable at the offices of the Board, authority being given for each by the inspector. These were large claims for any inspectorate and had they been adopted would powerfully have modified subsequent development of clerks or secretaries or directors to local authority education committees. But on 29 May 1872, the School Management Committee minutes stated:

"That in their opinion, it is not desirable that the Board should manage the school by inspectors but they think desirable where practicable to have several schools under the same management, especially when they are grouped so as to comprise various kinds of schools." 9

These were wise words, and indeed, a development of this idea of a group of managers being responsible for several schools of a locality has characterised the educational development plans of many local authorities, some as early as 1902, others since 1944. Dual management by school management committees acting in close co-operation with bodies of local managers, was in keeping with the slowly forming tradition of school boards being local educational parliament. A special committee on the constitution and powers of managers of board schools sat from 5 July 1882 to 16 November 1882, and the evidence taken clearly indicated that joint consultation was essential between the school management committee and the local board of managers.

It was not good enough for the former to act upon communication not made by the latter without at least giving the managers themselves the opportunity of expressing opinion (except in cases of emergency). Again, complaints against teachers in their schools should at least be made known to managers before executive action had been taken after due investigation. No better cases could be made out than this sub-committee's findings for local inspectors acting as liaison officers but certainly not in place of managers.

1.4 Board Inspectors and Advisers

It soon became quite clear that whatever type of general supervision might be preferred by individual boards, they all needed a certain number of specialists to help in pressing this supervision home. Just as clerks, solicitors, surveyors and attendance officers were all being appointed to meet particular needs, so too, was the inspector or adviser. His immediate royalty was to the clerk and school management committee. Initially, the greatest single objection to appointment of this kind was that already there existed government inspectors of schools whose work might thus be duplicated. A full dress debate on the question by the London School Board fittingly revealed the principles involved. W.S. Grover put the case for a separate school board inspectorate. If the Board undertook to control, manage and regulate their own schools, how was it possible to discharge that duty unless they had their own inspectors, so that they might see with their own eyes, hear with their own ears and judge with their judgement and have their regulations carried out effectively.

This was very much in line with Professor Huxley's view that, at all costs the evil of all evils should be averted, meddling with education by the state. If there was one thing more important than another for the school board, it was that inspection should be given up by the government and left to the energy of the school board.

As chairman of the scheme of education committee, he moved on 20 July 1871:-

"That inspectors be appoined by the Board to examine its schools and pupil teachers in all the subjects taught in each school and to report to the Board from time to time upon the discipline and general efficiency of the schools provided by the Board." 10

This motion was twice postponed but was finally approved on 11 October 1871, in a modified form:-

"That officers be appointed by the Board to visit its schools and to report to the Board from time to time upon the discipline and general efficiency of the schools provided by the Board." 11

This amendment was significant because it indicated the fear of an unnecessary duplication of inspectorates owing different allegiance. The duties prescribed for the board school inspectors and advisers was set down quite clearly:

- (1) To assist in organising schools provided by the Board.
- (2) To examine the scholars and pupil teachers in the subjects taught in schools.
- (3) To ascertain whether the books and apparatus are in good condition and whether the log books and registers are duly kept.
- (4) To make reports to the Board upon the efficiency of the schools.
- (5) To carry out the general instruction of the Board.

The wisdom of choosing heads of elementary schools as inspectors was emphasised in the minutes of 15 May, 1872:-

"That an examination of candidates for pupil teachers be held by one of the Board's inspectors and that the Board agrees to pay the advanced salary in the case of each candidate who passes until such a time as he or she passes the examination of the government inspector and can duly claim the grant under the scale." 12

Advisory duties devolved quickly upon the London Board inspectors, for example, only a month later, their advice was sought about wall-paper or wall-maps in schools, with comments to be made upon the existing ones in use. Their existence contributed to the Board's predisposition to make suggestions to teachers rather than issue

directives in such matters as the use of appropriate text books or copy books for hand writing. As the expansion of activities or duties by the bigger school boards continued, so the number of their general inspectors increased. Thus in London by 1886, there were five school board inspectors whose duties were set out as follows:-

- (1) To report week by week to the School Management Committee the result of observation made during their visits to schools, upon the state of schools as to the tone, efficiency of staff and the method employed in teaching.
- (2) To give special attention to the scripture and to object lessons and to weaker schools.
- (3) To report upon matters referred to them by the School Management Committee and to examine thoroughly and report upon such schools as the committee from time to time direct.
- (4) To visit the pupil teachers' schools and to superintend the general examinations held under the authority of the Board for scholarships, for scriptural prizes, and so on.

Quite apart from long hours worked, the five London School Board inspectors had an impossible task of examining effectively an average of 87 schools a year. It is not surprising, therefore, that the London School Board appointed a sixth inspector. It is important

to realise that the Board inspectors function stemmed from the school management committee's duty to consider and report upon matters referred to it by the Board.

What is wanted from the inspectors was not a treatise upon matters referred but a definite recommendation from which executive decisions could flow when confirmed by the Board. In this context, some six phases of work undertaken by the Board inspectors may be discerned, all of which were likely to grow in size and importance. The prime duty was that of visiting, inspecting or examining and reporting on every school or department under the Board at least once a year. It was largely objective in character and the periodical and systematic examination applied to the children on the standards of attainments the class teachers were judged. Reports upon teachers individually and school as a whole had to be laid before the School Management Committee and inspectors often preferred to be present at the committee meetings when these reports were discussed. The early relation of the Board inspectors report to Her Majesty's Inspectors report is noteworthy. Both reports were made annually usually with a six-month interval between them. HMIs report did not recommend any executive action to the Board. Teachers were the servants of the Board which paid their salary and it was left for the Board to make such decisions. HMI reported to the Education Department. Its power to influence Boards lay in the right it could and did exercise to withhold government grant-in-aid.

The value of Board Inspectors having been heads of schools was thus enhanced, for they understood perfectly the intricacies of the code. Boards inspectors' work went far beyond preparation for HMI examination to visit the Board's school at different times and to see that the work is carried out in accordance with the code and also in accordance with the Board's regulations. Board inspectors had many reasons for visiting schools. For example, to see individual teachers at work, to visit particular teachers in day schools with a view to their selection for evening school work, to check attendance and punctuality of teachers and pupils, periodically to call over class registers, to accept pupils for night schools, to assess candidates for teaching posts, to draw up promotion lists based on personal assessment of the classroom ability of teachers being considered for the post of principal, or head teacher timetables had to be scrutinised as well as class registers, fee-books and teachers time books. One particular phase of Board Inspectors work was related to examination in schools. Thus, London School Board inspectors examined children for the prizes offered by the religious societies and for prizes in annual physiology offered by the National Health Society. London School Board inspectors not only conducted the examination and marked the scripts but inspected the teaching as well.

Other duties devolving upon the Board inspectors were those of advising the appropriate committee upon questions of in-service education of teachers. London School Board had an eight-point grading

scale and inquiry was called for in case of teachers in the bottom three grades. A year's service emolument could be with-held by the Board as a result of their inspectors adverse report, the ultimate executive act of dismissal of a teacher for incompetence would also seem to have been frequently threatened if far less frequently implemented. The usual reason was alleged to be lack of class control, perhaps not surprising in view of the very large class sizes of 60 to 80 children, many of whom had not come to school willingly. Finally, the Board inspector was a liaison officer between the Board and School Management of individual schools.

The expansion of organising inspectors under the bigger school boards had a three-fold inspiration:-

- (1) To raise the standard of subject teaching in schools, thereby earning large government grants, but with the substitution of a block for a percentage grant based on numbers of passes, this particular incentive to appoint organisers became null and void.
- (2) To help train the general subject teacher in a particular subject, showing how by personal example, then watching teachers teach, correcting faults, improving technique. Such work ended in supervising the work of other teachers. It extended to both the newly appointed teachers in their first school to the more established teacher in search of training or refresher course.

Conceptions of how certain subjects should be taught changed considerably in the last quarter of the century and the organising inspector had a very strong part to play as adjuster to the newer ideas and their putting into practice, if he himself could not adjust, his services might be dispensed with.

(3) More often than not Boards turned to their organisers to help in putting these ideas into practice.

Middleham School Board had two inspectors by 1899. Their instructions, as adopted by the Board in April 1899, were as follows:-

It shall be the duty of each inspector

(1) To carefully ensure the carrying out of the rules of the Education Department and the regulation of the Board in schools.

(2) Where necessary, to direct principal teachers in the better organisation of the schools.

(3) To see that the school staffs are efficiently maintained in accordance with the rules of the Board, and that an adequate supply of pupil teachers is kept up in the school.

(4) To examine once a year in religious knowledge and to inspect periodically, not less than once in three months, each school or department. At these inspections, organisation, method and general

work to be observed, and at the direction of the inspector, classes examined. Close supervision to be exercised with regard to pupil teachers' periodical examination. The paper and schedules marked and copy of the tests applied to be forwarded to the inspector. The school in which there is weakness of instruction to be reported to the school managers in the ninth month and the inspectors, if so instructed, shall hold a special examination of such school before the close of the year. Reports of the examinations and inspections to be submitted to the school managers. The clerk of the Board to be supplied with the dates of the examinations in advance, in order that the same may appear on the monthly remembrance for the information of the members of the Board. Should further examination be required, they will be ordered by the school managers.

(5) To check all class registers four times a year and make the necessary entries in the log book.

(6) To visit the schools during the times set apart for the instruction of the children in religious knowledge, and to ensure that the pupil teachers have practice in teaching.

(7) To carefully check requisitions from day schools for books, apparatus and stationery. Write off in the stock and stores book all stock past used and cause unused stock to be returned to the stores.

- (8) To examine each year the pupil teacher of the Board in religious and secular knowledge and report thereon to the school manager.
- (9) To conduct annually an entrance examination for pupil teachers.
- (10) To report the absence from duty of any teacher.
- (11) To attend the government examination of the day schools.
- (12) To advise the clerk of any matter requiring attention in the school and to perform any other duty requested by the school manager.

The inspector shall keep a staff book for his schools, showing the teachers of all grades employed in each school or department, with their respective salaries, dates of appointments, qualifications and the average number of children in attendance for the preceeding year. The staff book shall be corrected from week to week and shall be laid before the school managers at each ordinary meeting. The inspector shall make a weekly return of his work for the information of the school managers. A similar return to be made by the assistant inspector.

In order that the inspectors may spend as much time as possible in the schools, they shall be relieved from attendance from committee meetings, except when required by managers and from office work during school hours. All reports and returns for the school managers shall

be delivered by the inspectors to the clerk each Saturday. The instructions of the managers shall be communicated to them by the clerk and the inspector shall act under his direction.

Board Inspectors were the servants of rate sensitive councillors whose dream was lower costs with better results, so that evidence of local inspectors work was very useful information for the triennial election time and invaluable to inspectors asking for salary upgrading. One school board went so far as to dismiss teachers not earning over a certain amount of government grant. Another dismissed a teacher after a poor report from HMI. Managing elementary education was like farming. If a benevolent government paid for certain crops, then these crops only were grown.

Fresh ideas or new ventures meant outlay of money: but only examination results brought it in in the form of increased government grant. Some local education authority inspectors then fell into the trap that HMIs had been driven into, of being merely agents of restrictive administrative policy. From evidence given before the Cross Commission, it was made clear that many responsible educationists believed that the Board Inspectors were frequently of more value than HMIs. Asked what different there was between him and HMI, T.G. Wright, Bristol School Board Inspector, pointed out: "I would give and do give greater allowance for the difficulties of the school." ¹³

Another witness' evidence was similar:-

Q.38116d: What is the necessity of having board and voluntary school inspectors? Why should not HMIs give all the information that is required?

HMIs cannot enter into those relationships with managers of a friendly and suggestive kind that the school superintendent would find it in his power to do.

Q.38116e: Does not HMIs give all the information as to proficiency and efficiency of the school that could be required, both for the use of the Board, as well as for the Department?

"Yes, but I think that a school superintendent attending a school in the interest of improvement in the character of the education and so forth is in a different position quite from that of HMI who is there as a critic, and who has the means of testing the attainments of the children with a view to the grant." 14

Q.38116f: Is it not the fact that HMI reports of passes in particular examination, while the Board Inspector gives a more general report as to the conduct and efficiency of a school?

"It is so. They thus had a width of insight into the educational life of a school unhappily denied at the time to HMI. The case of long criticised variation of standard left them with the process of assessment." 15

1.5 Excerpts from Examination and Inspection of Schools

(a) Bad Schools

Some schools not entitled to grant. From bad or unsatisfactory schools the merit grant should be with-held altogether. The cases under article 32b of the Revised Code and in which a deduction of one or more tenths was made for faults of instruction or discipline and organisation, would fall under this head. Other cases will occur which are not serious enough to justify actual deduction, but in which you observe there is a preponderance of indifferent passes, preventible disorder, dullness or irregularity; or that the teacher is satisfied with a low standard of duty. To schools of this class, no merit grant shall be awarded.

(b) Fair Schools

But a school of humble aims, which passes only a moderately successful examination, may be designated "fair", if its work is conscientiously done and is sound as far as it goes; and if the school is free from any conspicuous faults.

(c) Good Schools

Generally, a school may be expected to receive the mark "good" when both the number and quality of passes are satisfactory, when the scholars pass well in such class subjects as are taken up, and when the organisation, discipline, tone and general intelligence are such as to deserve commendation.

(d) Excellent Schools

The mark "excellent" should be reserved for cases of distinguished merit. A thoroughly good school in favourable conditions is characterised by cheerful and yet, exact discipline maintained without harshness and without noisy demonstration of authority. Its premises are cleanly and well ordered; its timetable provides a proper variety of mental employment, and of physical exercise, its organisation is such as to distribute the teaching power judiciously and to secure for every scholar - whether he is likely to bring credit to the school by examination or not - a fair share of instruction and attention. The teaching is animated and interesting, and yet thorough and accurate. The reading is fluent, careful and expressive, and the children are helped by questioning and explanation to following the meaning of what they read. Arithmetic is so taught as to enable the scholars not only to obtain correct answers to sums, but also to understand the reason of the process employed. If high subjects are attempted, the lessons are not confined to memory work and to the learning of technical terms, but are designed to give a clear knowledge of facts, and to train the learner in the practice of thinking and observing. ¹⁶

(e) Visits Without Notice

The Board Inspectors' occasional visits are what may be called "spying visits". They are visits without notice. They are paid in order to make sure that the registers are being properly kept and the schools worked according to the timetable, and that the managers have carried out the instructions which they were called upon to carry out

in a previous report. In spite of all this, it was the Board Inspector who was regarded as the teacher's friend, so far as any inspector ever can be, the government inspector their foe. The National Union of Teachers in its memorandum to the Bryce Commission in 1894, summed up both the differences between the two groups of inspectors and the value of their work in schools:

"The chief factor in any inspector is the personality of the inspector. An inspector of school should not only be just cautious and accurate in his habit of mind, he should also be sympathetic, genial, courteous and a lover of children. Above all, he should possess practical knowledge of teaching and should have had experience of the difficulties alike of both teacher and taught. Now experience has shown that, whereas the School Board when appointing advisory inspectors as their eyes and ears in the school have almost invariably have chosen men experienced in the difficulties of the work and practised in the art of teaching, my Lords of the Education Department, on the other hand, have almost invariably appointed as Her Majesty's Inspectors of Schools, men who lack such experience and practice. And while the work of inspectors appointed by the School Board has been generally helpful to the school, the work of many of the inspectors appointed by the Education Department has, to a very serious extent, been harmful to the schools. It follows, therefore, in the opinion of the Union, that the appointment of inspectors of secondary schools would more wisely rest with the local authority than with a minister and bureau." 17

1.6 Inspecting Secondary Schools

The 1902 Education Act made possible the development of state-maintained secondary schools. Robert Morant became permanent secretary of the Board of Education and reorganised the school inspectorate and three branches: elementary, secondary and technical, each headed by a chief inspector. One major change was that the 1902 Act enabled the new local education authority to provide secondary education out of the rates. Some higher grade elementary schools and pupil teacher centres were converted into secondary schools and a large number of new schools were also built.

In 1904, the Board of Education issued regulations for secondary schools and the new secondary branch was organised to undertake inspection of secondary schools. Some of the new secondary HMIs had been transferred from South Kensington, but there was a need for more specialists in languages and other subjects. Each secondary inspector had general duties in relation to secondary schools in his district, but a novel feature of the work of secondary HMIs was the concept of full inspection, by which a school was inspected as a whole, and the financial and other aspects of school management discussed with representatives of the governing body. To some extent, the LEA was also under scrutiny, as well as the teaching staff of the school, especially after the 1918 Education Act which made LEAs responsible for preparing complete schemes covering all the educational activities of the areas.

The new technical branch of HMI continued the work of the South Kensington Inspectors and also covered the work of evening continuation schools, as well as the engineering, building, mining and commercial subjects taught in various institutions of technical education. They also took on the responsibility for expanding classes in economics, politics and literary subjects organised by the workers Educational Association and other organisations.

1.7 The Blue Books: Suggestions for Teachers

The Revised Code was replaced by the Blue Book towards the end of the 19th century. The Board of Education Blue Book contained suggestions for teachers consideration and others interested with the work of public elementary schools. The following is the extract from the Blue Book:

"The only uniformity of practice that the Board desired to see in the teaching of public elementary schools is that each teacher shall think for himself and work out for himself such method of teaching as may use his powers to the best advantage and be best suited to the particular needs and conditions of the school." ¹⁸

The Blue Book was revised and reissued from time to time and provided evidence of increasing liberalisation of elementary education throughout 1920. Part of the credit for the growth of a progressive ideology must go to Edmond Holmes, who was the chief inspector for elementary schools from 1905 to 1911. His publication included: What is and what might be (1911) and reflected his experience as a reforming inspector.

Holmes' thesis was that the regimentation of children remained the dominant mode of teachers' behaviour long after the payment by results had been abolished. He criticised the teaching style which was designated to oppress the child and leaves nothing to his nature.

As E.G.A. Holmes stated in a letter to Sir John Gorst, 4 March, 1902, infant teachers themselves frequently stood in need of far more personal, as well as vocational education. A bare handful of progressive teachers were doing excellent experimental work; but many others favoured the old ways. The immediate result was that ideas and methods all too frequently lacked suitable preliminary exegesis; and in the ensuing confusion of criticism and counter criticism, local authority inspectors were unhappily caught up. Five specific charges were levelled against the prevailing trend away from individual examination, finding expression in a joint report by the seven London School Board inspectors in 1901, and representing a complete change of attitude by them from that of the previous few years. In the first place, the head's examination was now far less authoritative than that of the inspector's which it had replaced. This should be set in context with the Education Department's expressed policy of making heads responsible for the state of their own school, a policy also being followed by some bigger school boards.

Secondly, results were now of far less importance than teaching. In this, London Board inspectors were considering the panacea of an ideal attainment test as the measure of efficiency in schools. As ex-heads themselves, they saw the danger of some teachers "free-wheeling".

They knew inspection by sampling might call into being evils greater than the new system was meant to cure.

In the third place, notebooks of children, writing on the black-board, are all a waste of time which should be discouraged.

The fourth charge was that the Board of Education in London now failed to distinguish in many of its inspectors reports between genuine efficiency and non-efficiency, and more specifically between efficient and non-efficient teachers. In this lies the fundamental opposition to a more general type of school inspection.

"Individual examination gives an accurate assessment of what children have learnt and if this is so, it also assesses directly the teacher's own efficiency." 19

What the London School Board inspectors were now saying was that the only accurate measure of efficiency was the number of passes a teacher got for his class on examination day. But even with such a measure, the hands that use it may vary enormously. This has been one of teachers' complaints against HMI: The scaled degree: Excellent, good and fair had tended to change unexpectedly with consequent protests from school boards and teachers. Edge was given to the complaints because inspectors opinions could still increase or decrease salaries of teachers. The only answer was a capitation grant to schools and Burham salary scale.

Fifthly, it was alleged that heads of schools were different about and shrank from their duty of writing adverse reports on members of their staff. It might be a compliment to inspectors that teachers should prefer them to write such reports but in just this lay the greatest danger that any inspectorate had to negotiate that this is cutting across head-staff relationships. At this particular time, too, it was doubly dangerous, because the teaching profession was beginning to feel its strength in unity, hence the natural reluctance of heads to criticise members of staff in public.

Support for the stand thus taken came from all over the country.

"it brought local and central government inspectors into head-on collision, extending from day school to evening school policy. The Board of Education and the new local education authorities were in duty bound to support their respective inspectorates." ²⁰

Again, in the case of the London School Board,

"it brought local inspectors into an open quarrel with the teachers, whose councillors they had long been...." ²¹

.....Furthermore,

"After contributing so much to the progressive attitude of the Board, it now seemed they had become reactionary or so the NUT thought." ²²

To complete this unhappy picture, inspectorial tensions were thrown into sharper relief, partly as a result of this clash of opinion, but partly, too, of a deep seated socio-economic origin.

E.G.A. Holmes was expressing a personal point of view when he said that:

"As compared with the ex-elementary teacher usually engaged in the hopeless task of surveying or trying to survey a wide field of action from a well worn grove, the inspectors of public schools of the varsity type has the advantage of being able to look at elementary education from a point of view of complete detachment and therefore, of being able to handle its problems with freshness and originality." 23

Local authority inspectors were ex-elementary school heads among the best in the profession. All resented in varying degrees what the School Guardian called amateur inspection by HMI implying the latter's lack of previous shop-floor experience, yet those who had such experience were de-barred from what seemed to them a natural promotion to full HMI. The 140 resolutions of protests from NUT Local Association and relentless agitation of the school master, indicated a different opinion among elementary school teachers. A similar tension socio-economic in origin was reflected at this time within the ranks of HMI Inspectors' Assistants, as provided by the Revised Code, had continued to be appointed up to 1882. In that year, the post of sub-inspector was created with duties approximating to those of school inspector. The

dissatisfied voice of the old inspector's assistant could be heard in the evidence of J. Fitch before the Cross Commission in 1887-1888: doing similar work to their masters, they were but excellent drudges on a much lower salary and starved of promotion.

1.8 Since 1944

The 1944 Education Act was a major educational reform which remained the basic legislation governing the English educational system until 1988. Its achievements included the provision of universal secondary education up to the age of 15, and the abolition of fees in state-maintained schools. After 1944, primary education from ages 5-11, was followed automatically by secondary education from ages 11-15 years. The 1944 Act states:

"It shall be the duty of the local education authority for every area, so far as their powers extend, to contribute towards the spiritual, moral, mental and physical development of the community by securing that efficient education throughout those stages shall be available to meet the needs of the population of their area." ²⁴

The main all-purpose education authority became the 62 county and 83 county borough councils. The functions to be exercised in relation to maintained schools by the head, bodies of managers and of governors and the local authority, are clearly set down in the various instruments and articles of management or government.

In the process of selecting and training its future leaders, an authority will offer some of these courses:

1. Running courses or conferences to different groups of teaching and non-teaching staff in the area.

2. Encouraging teachers to see much good teaching as they can, both in the area and outside it.

3. Assisting financially all teachers who wish to attend courses of their own choice at regional or national level; such courses may not be only the familiar short courses, but also long ones involving period of secondment.

4. Stimulating and encouraging all forms of experimental teaching in school.

5. Offering grant-in-aid to the various teachers associations to run their own study group or courses, and helping them publish their reports where research had been undertaken.

6. Developing all forms of joint participation between teachers, professional officers and lay-committees in planning phases of educational policies in relation to local needs and priorities.²⁵

In some areas, a combination of activities of this kind has enabled the authority to plan imaginatively for future spiritual, moral, physical, emotional and mental needs in terms for example, of education for work. In this, the role of the local education authority inspector is variable, present duties have grown out of past ones. Through them passes the two-way flow of ideas and recommendation between teacher and administrator. This, indeed, underlies one of the most recent definitions of inspection as:-

"A service to interpret to teachers and the public, the education policies of the authority and also to interpret to the competent authorities, the experiences, needs and aspirations of teachers and local communities." 26

It is necessary to note that not all local authorities employ their own inspectors, though there is a permissive clause (Section 77, Sub-Section 3) in the 1944 Act. On the other hand, some local authorities make full use of teams of inspectors with their own structure of office, headed by a chief inspector. A tradition is still preserved in that the majority of them have been heads of schools and/or had teacher-training experience.

The overall increase in numbers is somewhat difficult to determine, because nomenclature, conditions of service and allocation of duties vary so greatly. With the development of fresh emphasis in teaching, particularly in relation to the all-sided growth of the

child. Some authorities, until quite recently have appointed specialist subject organisers as in physical education or in rural science, domestic subjects, art, music and handicraft. Their work was more or less advisory, though there are elements in it of a more executive nature, such as writing individual reports, sharing in full inspection of schools, advising governors or managers in the appointment of staff. The present use of organisers in the form of peripatetic teachers in shortage subjects as science, is particularly relevant in this context, and this may be the pattern for the future.

"Overall, there seemed to have been a 60% increase in the organisers and inspectors over the period 1939-1951: their size varies but in London county, a figure of 0.3% of the whole education service may be quoted and 5% of the administrative costs." ²⁷

1.9 The Role of Inspectors and Advisers

The most concise general account of the work of the inspectors and advisers was provided by the National Association of Inspectors and Educational Organisers in their evidence to the Select Committee on HMI:

" The function of an inspectorate at national and local levels. Inspectors of schools at national and local levels are appointed to put at the disposal of elected representatives, administrators, head teachers and teachers, their educational knowledge and expertise based on their qualifications and experience. Both types of inspector contribute to the efficient functioning of the schools, the following duties being similar for HMI and LEA Inspectors

1. Inspecting and reporting on the work in schools and colleges, this involves suggesting to head teachers and teachers, improvements that might be made in organisations, curriculum methods, approach and attitudes; it also involves suggesting to education authorities, improvements might be advisable in staffing, building, furniture and equipment. Particularly careful attention must be given to newly established schools and to schools where there are special difficulties arising from the age of the building or the social deprivation of the children in attendance.
2. Advising administrators and architects on the planning, furnishing and equipment of schools.
3. Meeting special situations calling for improvised planning and organisation, such as that created for authorities by an influx of immigrants requiring special help.
4. Stimulating interest in creative approaches to education in all school activities during visits to schools by organising and participating in courses and meetings for heads, and arranging visits for them to schools where sound developments are taking place.

With respect to the function of the inspector at local level, such duties would not normally be carried out by HMI. These include the following:-

1. Inspecting and reporting to the local authority on the work of head teachers and teachers seeking promotion within the service of the authority or in the service of other authorities. The quality of education provided in a school depends very largely upon the ability and personality of the head teacher and teachers appointed to posts of responsibility; the giving of appropriate and sound advice when appointments are being made to key positions is, therefore, of great importance.
2. Supervising the work of teachers in their first posts after leaving College of Education or University Department of Education and informing the Department of Education and Science upon their completion satisfactorily or otherwise of their period of probation.
3. Interview teachers seeking posts in the authority's school, allocating teachers to schools if the process of allocation is performed by administrative officers, the guidance of local inspectors is usually sought.
4. Transmitting information and views from the authorities to teachers and from teachers to the authority, from the authority to various organisations interested in education, parents and

the general public and transmitting the views expressed by these organisations and individuals to the authority.

5. Advising administrators and others on various aspects of educational experiment such, for example, as is sponsored by the National Foundation for Educational Research, The Public Examination Boards and other bodies, and providing information to these bodies on behalf of the authority.

6. Guiding over considerable period of time new developments in educational methods as for example, the use of initial teaching of alphabet, the English as a second language, new approaches to the teaching of modern languages, humanities, religious education and approaches to mathematics and science, new approaches to home economics and creative activities of all kinds, including movement, drama, writing of prose and poetry, music, and art and craft.

7. Taking administrative action to ensure that suitable sums are allocated in the education authority's estimates for expenditure upon in-service training of teachers, the equipping of schools and teachers' centres and supervising the expenditure of the sums.

8. Consulting with architects at the local level in the planning, furnishing and equipping of new schools after the initial decisions have been made on the general plans of each building, the work is

very detailed, including for example, indicating where gas, water and electricity services should be available, selecting suitable furniture, making suggestions about the type and quality of equipments to be installed.

Inspectors consult with teachers upon these matters.

"The present system on which the local inspectorates operate is reasonably effective in authorities with a sufficiently large school population and sufficient enlightenment and financial resources to employ a full complement of local inspectors and advisers. Areas with sparser population and fewer resources or very small authorities are less well served, since very few advisory officers are employed. It does not appear that the balance is redressed by the deployment of greater numbers of HMIs in these areas." 28

1.10 The Structure and Size of an Inspectoral Team

According to National Association of Inspectors and Educational Organisers, there appears to be a variety of successful ways of organising of an inspectorial team. The basic patterns appear to be as follows:-

1. An inspector or group of inspectors is responsible for primary schools, another inspector or group of inspectors is responsible for secondary schools, and a team of specialists is responsible for work in subjects. Work is co-ordinated by the primary and secondary school inspectors or by a chief or senior inspector. 29

2. A group of general inspectors is responsible for primary and secondary school within a district of the authority and a team of specialist inspectors is responsible for work in subjects work is co-ordinated by the district inspector or by the chief or senior inspector.

3. A group of Inspectors is responsible for primary and secondary schools within a district and also for a specialism throughout the area of the authority. Work is co-ordinated by a senior or chief inspector.

Local government reorganisation stimulated considerable discussion about the right size of an inspectorial team. In their evidence to the Radcliffe Maude Committee, the NAIEO argued that the establishment of an effective body of inspectors, organisers and advisory officers through whom the education authority is able to provide the full range of services in this educational field should satisfy the following basic requirements.

1. A Chief Inspector to co-ordinate the work of all officers.
2. A general inspector for every 60,000 of the total population or for every 10,000 of the school population.

In the earlier submission of evidence, the National Association of Inspectors and Education Organisers had argued that the size of advisory

team is to a large extent governed by the size of the authority but, at present, many anomalies exist. It is the view of our association that a reasonable establishment might be one adviser for each 20,000 population. So that, for example, an authority of 400,000 would have an advisory team of twenty. Small authorities may need a more generous staffing ratio, since a team of fifteen would appear to be the minimum to provide adequate coverage.

Fiske, ³⁰ summarised the main issues relating to the size of advisory teams in relation to local government reorganisation. Most of the arguments appeared to be based upon a rather unclear mixture of criteria which included the sizes of effective teams already in existence, overall LEA population, school population and the need for adequate coverage of subjects and other specialisation.

Fiske himself argued for 20 as his ideal sized team, basing this on the assessment of adequate specialist coverage. Fifteen was a widely favoured figure, but the criteria were either implicit or varied. The actual sizes of teams varied enormously prior to local government reorganisation. For example, the authorities of roughly the same population, Bath and Barnsley, had none and 7 advisers respectively, but Bath had at least one assistant education officer who carried out what were essentially advisory duties.

The relatively large number of physical education organisers was already apparent in 1922, by which time they were the biggest

single group (Board of Education, 1917).

MacIntosh, 1968 provides some fascinating insight. A general concern for the health of the nation's children motivated various governments, but it is also clear that this concern became urgent in time of war. The central government provided a substantial grant-in-aid to encourage local authorities to appoint physical education organisers via the Board of Education 1917-1918, 1919, 1920, 1921, 1923, 1936, 1937.

1.14 Advisers and Administrators

One of the main groups with whom advisers are directly concerned are the LEA administrative education officers. What perceptions do they hold of each other? Kogan and Van der Eyden, 1973 presented a useful account of a chief education officer's expectation of her advisers in their interview with Claire Pratt, ex-Chief Education Officer at Hillingdon LEA.

Fiske, ³¹ had earlier provided a more detailed exposition of this perspective in a lecture given to the National Association of Inspectors and Education Advisers. He argued that, in the light of the three key reports, Mallaby, 1966; Maude, 1967 and Maude, 1969; local authority advisers must be drawn from the ranks of experienced teachers and head teachers since they must be first and foremost professional educationists rather than local government administrators.

He went on to identify their major functions to be the keeper of the conscience of CEO, i.e. to give advice based upon educational criteria, to safeguard standard, i.e. to inspect schools and teachers; to advise on the appointment and promotion of staff; to advise teachers on their individual career; to organise in-service courses; to facilitate and stimulate curriculum development and the exchange of ideas between schools; to provide support and a counselling service for head teachers. To carry out these tasks, Fiske specified a team of twenty specialist advisers and examined some of the criteria for deciding upon the size of a team. He concluded that because many LEAs would not be in a position to establish teams of an appropriate size, advisers should re-examine their way of working with a view to dropping inessential jobs.

Advisers and inspectors themselves had mixed feelings about their relationship with administrators and about their relative status. The Presidential Address to the 1972 National Association of Inspectors and Education Organisers Conference, pointed to the danger of getting too close to the administrators and of our ambivalent situation being neither teacher nor administrator. ³²

In their earlier submission of evidence to the Select Committee on HMIs, the NAIEA put the position thus: The work of inspectors of all kinds is educational rather than administrative, and is very closely concerned with the quality of educational provision in schools. Most local education authorities, however, appear to regard

the appointment of inspectors and advisers unlike that of teachers and head teachers as administrative, rather than educational.

Although the decision to employ such officers rests with education of the council whose members are acquainted with the needs of the service and the school, this decision may not be supported by the Finance and Establishment Committee with the result that the number of inspectors and advisers employed is, in practice, regulated by the deployment of financial resources, rather than by educational need or concern for the quality of education provided. There may be refusal to employ than the minimum numbers of such officers.

As the duties to be undertaken in the advisory field increase, the lack of suitable officers in some areas must lead to deterioration in the services, while in areas that are understaffed, individual inspectors find themselves carrying such a wide range of unco-ordinated duties that the attention that they can give to them tends to become hurried and superficial than is desirable.

The variation in practice, as between one authority and another, is reflected in the lack of comparability between the criteria of appointment and duties undertaken and the salary scale paid to officers under different authorities. The rapid increase in the new forms of school organisation and introduction of many new approaches to learning often involving the use of expensive equipment which requires skill handling is encouraging the establishment by many authorities of teachers' centres. Local inspectors welcome

them, exercise considerable influence over them and direct much of the work that takes place there in courses and study groups, meetings and work sections. Directors of such centres and advisory and administrative, and technical staff are being appointed on different terms and salary scales by different authorities. The final paragraph in the quotation is indicative of the concern felt by the advisers about the growth in the number of teachers' centre wardens. A central concern of the NAIEA at this time was with status and salaries, and their President was reflecting the views of the members when he said:-

"But make no mistake about it, local government re-organisation presented us with the greatest chance we have had for a decade of getting establishments, conditions and salaries nearer to the point of justice." 33

1.12 Advisers and Teachers

The second of the two main client groups of advisers are heads and teachers. What do they think of advisers and inspectors? Do they value their advice? Do they respect their professional judgment? Taylor and Dale, 1971 carried out a survey of 10% national sample of probationary teachers and their heads. They discovered that 33% of primary and 44% of secondary probationary claimed not to have been visited by an adviser by the end of their first year; that inspectors or advisers had the responsibility for writing reports on probationers in 81% of LEAs: that they had the final responsibility in 54% of LEAs; that by the end of their first year, 65% of probationers said

they did not know in what way their progress was being assessed or to whom and in what form their assessment would be reported, and that there were wide regional variations in the number of probationer's extensions (e.g. probationers in Greater London 5.8% were much more likely to have their probationary period extended than those boroughs outside Greater London (4.3%) or in counties (3%). It may be noted that only 22% of Taylor and Dale's sample of probationers said they had discussed their work or problems with an adviser or inspector by the end of the first year, and this contrasted sharply with the number saying they wanted to do so. 34

"Bolam, 1973 action research study of probationer's induction programmes, largely corroborated the earlier Bostol findings on assessment, but it added some relevant contextual information on probationer's perception of advisers: The probationers were asked to indicate the ways in which they thought colleagues, heads and advisers, could be of most help to them. Advisers were seen as having the lesser general supportive role; were criticised as being seldom seen but were regarded as being the principal source of advice of an objective and impartial kind, and of advice on assessment and in-service training and staff development." 35

Relatively few probationers saw them as helping directly with their classroom and subject problems.

"Research evidence about the views of experienced teachers is minimal. Tinker, 1986 concluded that there is no doubt that the role performed by LEA Inspectors is very highly regarded by head teachers, governors and managers." 36

"Taylor et al 1974, studied the relative power of various influences on systems in the primary school curriculum and concluded that the advisory system which included LEA advisers has less influence than within school factors and public opinions." 37

"Goodwin, 1968 mentioned some of the head's apprehensions. LEA advisers tend to have a close and sometimes very close contact with the teachers of their own subjects in one's school. This is natural. Often, the adviser appointed or helped to appoint the teachers in the first place; moreover, the teachers work is under the supervision of the adviser. From the teachers point of view, therefore, the LEA adviser is the embodiment of that greater power which resides in the office. Someone it pays to be on the right side of. In the circumstances, the adviser can easily form a relationship with the teacher which, if not guarded against, can supplant or undermine the position of the head as the ultimate authority in the school, in such matters as the planning and directing of work, the ordering of the equipment, no direct action should be taken by any adviser, except in so far as the head has been approached and has approved. Even in the routine visits of a fairly non-consequential nature, the adviser should always tell the head of the substance of what has passed between him and the teacher visited. It is very easy for the specialist teacher, especially at the time of friction with the headmaster, to contact his specialist adviser, to seek for comfort, support or advice without the head's knowledge." 38

In their written evidence to the Select Committee on HMIs, the NUT argued the need for the teacher to be able to work without having

much interruption in his classroom work, and for the head teacher not to be subject to a stream of organisers, advisers and inspectors who tend to make excessive demands on time that could be better spent. The over-multiplication of local organisers/advisers does not always increase the faith of the teacher "in the power that be". The NUT also placed great stress on the independence of HMIs as compared with the LEA adviser. The independence of HMIs means much to the teacher. The local authority inspector does not enjoy this independence. He is the agent of the teacher's employer and the stubble relationship between teacher and HMI is entirely different to that between teacher and local inspector. The local inspector is subject to local pressure from which HMI is free.

The NUT now views with the deepest apprehension any suggestion of passing the general inspection work of HMIs to a strengthened local inspectorate. The evidence goes on:-

"Although we hold that the main work of HMIs is of an advisory nature, we cannot deny that there will be occasions when the reputation of an individual school may demand the exercise of the inspectorial function. In such a situation which may give rise to strong local feelings of partisanship, a visitation by HM Inspector personnel and independence, is more likely to be of real impartial value to the authority and more acceptable to the teachers already under strain of local origin. In a possible subsequent local enquiry evidence of a prosecuting nature should not be provided by the employees of the authority representatives who form the committee of enquiry. It would be a strain on natural justice if these local inspectors should, at one and the same time, provide incriminating as experts." 39

Having described the national background, it is now necessary to recount the context of the case selected for the empirical core of this thesis.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. Rich, E.E., Elementary Education Act, 1870, Section 7, London, Longmans,
2. *ibid*, Section 14.
3. Maire, R.H., School Boards or our Educational Parliament 1872.
4. Professor Huxley, The School Boards; What they Are and What they May Do.
5. Edmonds, C.I., The School Inspector, pp.91-
6. London School Board: School Management Committee Minutes, January 1872.
7. London School Board: School Management Committee Minutes, 18th October, 1871.
9. London School Board: School Management Committee Minutes, 29th May, 1872.
10. London School Board: School Management Committee Minutes, 5th July, 1872.
11. London School Board: Minutes of Committee, 11th October, 1872.
12. London School Board, Education Committee Minutes, 15th May, 1872.

13. Edmonds, C.L., op.cit., p.116.
14. ibid.
15. ibid, pp.116-117.
16. ibid, pp.117,118.
17. NUT's Memorandum of Evidence submitted to Bryce Commission in 1894.
18. Examination and Assessment of Teachers.
19. Fitch, The Inspection of Secondary Schools, as referred to by Edmonds, C.L., op.cit., p.142.
20. London School Board Evening Continuation School Committee Minutes, 16th November, 1903.
21. London School Board School Management Committee Minutes, 2nd May, 1903.
22. London School Board Minutes, 26th November, 1903.
23. Holmes, E.G.A., on Ex-elementary teachers/inspectors and the inspector of public schools of the Varsity type, survey a field of action.
24. Alexander, W.R., and Bassachouch, F., County and Voluntary Schools, 2nd October, 1952.

25. What an authority would do in the process of training its future leaders.
26. Definition of Inspection as a service.
27. Increase in the size of inspectors and advisers and in the cost of their maintenance.
28. Assessment of the present system on which the local inspectorates operate.
29. The Structure and Size of an Inspectorial Team by the NAIEA.
30. NAIEA's President remarks on the status of members.
31. *ibid.*
32. *ibid.*
33. *ibid.*
34. Bolam, et al, 1979.
35. *ibid.*
36. *ibid.*
37. *ibid.*

38. *ibid.*

39. NUT's evidence on the Inspectorial role of HMI.

CHAPTER TWO

THE HISTORY OF EDUCATION IN MIDDLEHAM: 1870-1988

2.1 Old Middleham; The Setting for the Development of Educational Services

If it were possible to go back some 170 years to the beginning of the 19th century, Middleham would be seen as a small but important market town of considerable character.¹ The town itself extended from Crown Hill to the Suran and Sugar Loaf, and from Park Lane to Old Town, containing many picturesque buildings of considerable antiquity. The population in 1801 was 5,743 and with poor roads, most people travelled little and many people lived, worked and died within a few miles of their birth place. Local materials were used for buildings - wood, locally made bricks. But great changes were on the way. Transport developments during the early years of the 19th century linked London with Middleham by means of Surrey Iron Railway and canal and later by steam railway. The small market town began to expand rapidly. By 1851, the population reached 20,343 and by 1901, it was 134,037. This process continued in the 20th century as the population increased to 233,032 in 1931, and to 249,870 in 1951. In the course of this rapid expansion, the whole character of the town changed. Commons, farms and woods were swept away to be covered by houses. The little shops and houses, characteristics of many English market towns were swept away, to be replaced by large shos and stores, churches, factories and workshops. Streets were

widened, trees were felled and industries grew up, declined and disappeared as fashions changed and technology developed.

The transition from a rural condition to an urban one is not an easy one. Middleham lost some beautiful countryside and some charming buildings. It lost its rivers, streams and ponds.

2.2 Middleham School Board

The Elementary Education Act of 1870 required that School Boards should be established to provide schools wherever they were needed, the necessary funds to be raised by local rates. Until 1870, the doctrine was that elementary education should be provided by voluntary bodies, assisted by grants from the Committee of Council on Education. By 1870, it was seen that the voluntary bodies alone could never provide a universal system, hence the Act of 1870.

Bye-Laws:

These were as stated below:-

Whereas, by the 74th Section of the Elementary Act, 1870 it is enacted that every school board, may from time to time, with the approval of the Education Department, make Bye-Laws for all or any of the following:-

1. Requiring the parents of children of such age, not less than five years nor more than thirteen years, to cause such children to attend school.

2. Determining the time during which children are to attend school provided that no such Bye-Laws shall prevent the withdrawal of any child from any religious observance or instruction in religious subjects, or shall require any child to attend school on any day exclusively set apart for religious observance by the religious body to which the parent belongs.

3. Providing for the remission or payment of the whole or part of the fees of any child, where the parent satisfies the School Board that he is unable from poverty to pay the same.

4. Imposing penalty for the breach of Bye-Laws.

5. Revoking or altering any Bye-Laws

Provided that any Bye-Law under this section shall provide for the total or partial exemption of such child from the obligation to attend school if one of Her Majesty's Inspectors certifies that such child has reached a standard of education specified in such Bye-Laws.

And by the said 74th section of the 1870 Act, it is further enacted that, any of the following reasons shall be a reasonable excuse, namely:-

1. That the child is under efficient instruction in some other manner.

2. That the child has been prevented from attending school by sickness or any other unavoidable cause.

3. That there is no public elementary school open which the child can attend, within such distance, not exceeding three miles, measured according to the nearest road from the residence of such child.

Penalty for Breach of Bye-Laws:

For the said 74th section, it is further enacted, that any proceeding to enforce any Bye-Laws may be taken and any penalty for the breach of any Bye-Laws may be recovered in a summary manner.

Payment of School Fees:

Every child attending a school provided by the School Board, shall pay such weekly fee as may be prescribed by the School Board, with the consent of the Education Department.

25th section authorising School Board to pay school fees in case of poverty. The School Board may, if they think fit, from time to time, for a period not exceeding six months, pay the whole or any part of the school fees, payable at any public elementary school, by any child resident in their district, whose parent is, in their opinion, unable from poverty to pay the same.

2.3 Appointment of an Officer or Officers to Enforce Attendance at School

By the 36th section of the 1870 Act, every School Board may, if they think fit, appoint an officer or officers to enforce any Bye-Laws under that Act, with reference to attendance of children at school, and to bring children who are liable under the Industrial Schools Act, 1866, to be sent to a certified industrial school, before two Justices, and any expenses incurred under this section may be paid out of the school fund.

2.4 Education in Middleham

So, in 1889, education in Middleham provided by the following:-

1. Middleham School Board in respect of some elementary schools.

2. Voluntary bodies, mainly the churches, in respect of other elementary schools, assisted by grants from the Committee of the Council on Education.

3. The independent schools, such as provided by the Whitgift Foundation.

Election of School Boards were directly elected for three years. In 1885, an election produced the following members to serve for three years:-

William Darlow Sarjeant -

Julius Klein - Principal, Civil Service Institute

James Smith - Gentleman

Martin Luther Moss - Manufacturer

Samuel Smith - Physician and Surgeon

Braham Pitt - Civil Servant

Harry George Brown - Merchant

Florence Hunt - Spinster

Richard Whitehead - Vicar

Arthur Brook - Manufacturer

John Braithwaite - Vicar and Dean

Robert Sherriff Dick - Merchant

Christopher James Street - Minister of Religion

The chairman was Vicar of Middleham, the Rev. J.M. Braithwaite.

The schools provided by the School Boards were intended to remedy the situation which existed in 1870 when there was only one place for every three to five children eligible to attend school. Elementary schools were intended for what was known as 'the labouring poor'.

Middleham School Board was in, no doubt, about its duty. In 1872, it presented a memorial to the Secretary of State for War against the proposal to establish a military depot in Middleham. The memorial

The memorial pointed out that the School Boards were charged with the important duty of establishing a system of public education in this extensive and increasingly populous suburban district.

One can deprecate their patronage, but a study of their minute book entitled them to respect for their achievements. They did establish a public system of education, they began evening school; they were concerned with the training of teachers and by their system of pupil/teacher training gave the only secondary education which was available for many children and by encouraging such activities - as boot and shoe clubs and penny dinners - they showed a proper social concern. Their debates were keen to judge from the number of divisions recorded.

It is quite impossible to guess how far some members motive was charity rather than equity. The change in emphasis from the first to the second reflects the change from their time to ours. It is of interest, too, that they were concerned with the teaching of swimming to the senior boys in the Board's schools. If the sanction of the Department can be obtained thereto.

Fees were payable in the Board schools and voluntary schools. Though the age of compulsory school attendance was between five and thirteen, exemption could be granted after the age of ten to children who had reached a certain standard. It was not until 1 January, 1894 that the age of exemption from school attendance was raised to eleven.

The work of the School Board, with meetings usually was very detailed. It approved exemption from attendance, granted remission of fees, authorised summons for non-attendance and approved each single cheque to be issued on its behalf. It is interesting to see that the new code proposed by the Department in 1882, laid down that in calculating the staff of the school, an assistant teacher will count as sufficient for 60 scholars instead of 80 as before, and a pupil/teacher will count as sufficient for 30 scholars. A pupil/teacher could be as young as fourteen.

Site values seemed to appreciate them. In December, 1885 a sum of £680 was authorised for the proposed site Woodside for a group of schools, on January 7th, 1890 a cheque for £1,102 was authorised. The brief for Woodside showed that the principal rooms for the boys' and girls' should each accommodate 125 pupils and other classrooms, 50 each. The schools were to cost not more than £6,000.

In 1889, an Act was passed to facilitate the provision of technical instruction. It did this by allocating to education, additional money from beer and spirits (properly, the whisky money).¹

In 1889, elementary schools counted by the School Board were:-

Princess Road Boys' School
 Princess Road Girls' School
 Princess Road Junior School
 Princess Road Infant School

Beulah Road Boys' School
 Beulah Road Girls' School
 Beaulah Road Junior School
 Beaulah Road Infant School

South Norwood Boys' School
 South Norwood Girls' School
 South Norwood Junior School
 South Norwood Infant School

Oval Road Boys' School
 Oval Road Girls' School
 Oval Road Junior School
 Oval Road Junior School
 Oval Road Infant School

Brighton Road Boys' School
 Brighton Road Girls' School
 Brighton Road Junior School
 Brighton Road Infants' School

Mitcham Road Boys' School
 Mitcham Road Girls' School
 Mitcham Road Junior School
 Mitcham Road Infant School

Sydenham Road Boys' School
 Sydenham Road Girls' School
 Sydenham Road Junior School
 Sydenham Road Infant School

Upper Norwood Boys' School
 Upper Norwood Girls' School
 Upper Norwood Infant School

From a list in the Minutes of 1883, the voluntary elementary schools were:-

St. Mark's School, South Norwood
 St. Andrew's School, Church Road
 Christ Church School, Longley Road
 Christ Church School, Thorton Heath
 Christ Church School, Wildbores
 St. James' School, Gloucester Road
 St. Luke's School, Woodside

St. Stevens School, North Park
 Holy Trinity School, Selhurst
 St. Peters Infant School, Beledon Road
 St. Michael's Orphanage, Woodside
 National Schools, Shirley
 St. Joseph's School, Central Hill, Upper Norwood
 St. Mary's Convent School, Upper Norwood
 St. John's School, Old Palace
 British School, Tamworth Road
 All Saint Schools, Upper Norwood
 Good Shepherd School, Union Road
 Parish Church School, Westfield Road
 St. Mary's School, Wellisey Road

2.5 After the 1902 Act

The School Board ceased and the Council of the County Borough became a local education authority after the Act of 1902.

In brief, since 1889, there have been the following changes:-

The Council of the County Borough became a local education authority in 1902, with the power to maintain secondary schools. It now maintained the following schools:-

Primary	County	55
	Voluntary Controlled	5
	Voluntary-aided	6
Secondary Selective	County	6
	Voluntary-aided	2
Non-Selective	County	19
	Voluntary-aided	4
Special		3

The Middleham School Board undertook to provide schools for 4,000 children, the maintained school of the county borough have almost 36,000 children on roll, and in the Education and Physical Training and Recreation Acts to help youth, it maintains Adult Education co-operates with responsible bodies and the university maintains a teachers' and adult education centre, and administers a school camp at Pilgrim Forth.

The Education Committee has since 1956 sought approval to the establishment of a training college in Middleham, and it has shown interest in the possibility of a university foundation.

In brief, the county borough willingly exercised the wide duty laid on it by Section VII of the Act. That is, it shall be the duty of the local education authority for every area, so far as their power extended to contribute towards the spiritual, moral, mental and physical development of the community by securing that efficient education throughout these stages shall be available to meet the needs of the population of the area.

The stages are, of course, primary, secondary and further education. This is a great development from the original result of the School Board, to provide elementary instruction in reading and writing, and arithmetic.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. Natural History and Scientific Society Limited, 96a Brighton Road, South Croydon, Surrey CR2 6AD.

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH, RATIONALE AND METHODOLOGY

3.1 The Context: Middleham Today

Middleham today has much of the atmosphere and supports most of the functions of a provincial city. Many of the market towns and villages within fifteen miles of London were swamped away as the great metropolis spread out. Middleham is unique in the way it developed over a lengthy period with its suburbs merging into those of London during the late 1920s. The population then was already around 200,000. For many years, in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, it became largely residential with much of its population, especially white collar workers, employed in London. But the town still retained its importance as the local centre of a large area for shopping, commercial and industrial purposes.

The town centre was transformed in the late 1950s and 1960s when a number of Victorian houses with large gardens were redeveloped and replaced by towering office blocks. These offices employ some 30,000 people. The concrete and glass masses of the new office blocks rise high above the surrounding townscape and can be seen for miles around, providing a spectacular focal point for the centre of the borough.

Middleham, with a population of about 234,000 is the largest of all the London boroughs, and the tenth largest town in Britain.

The borough now covers an area of about 33½ square miles and includes the local districts of Addington, Addiscombe, Broad Green, Coulsdon, Kenley, New Addington, Norbury, Pereley, Sander Stead, South Middleham, Thornton Heath, Upper Norwood, Kladdon, Whyleleafe, Woodcote and Woodside. Many of the residential districts consist of 19th or 20th century development.

3.2 Employment in Middleham

With its responsibility for running so many importance services within the borough, including schools, highways and social services, Middleham Council is itself the biggest employee in the area, with more than 12,500 on the payroll, including some 6,000 full-time employees. In total, some 150,000 people work in the borough, over a third of whom are based in the offices and shops in Middleham town centre. Of these, some 38,000 or 72% are employed in office-based services such as insurance, financial and professional. Others in transport and communications, catering and other small business and industrial-type activities.

The borough's working population amounts to around 160,000 people, of whom more than half actually work in Middleham; most of the remainder work either in central or inner London. Along with Middleham Council, there are several organisations in the borough, both in the public and private sectors, employing many thousands of people. On the private side these include, British Gas, British Telecom, Alders,

Nestle's and Phillips, and in the public sector, British Railways, Middleham Health Authority, Department of the Environment and the Home Office.

3.2.1 Unemployment:

As in other parts of the South-east, unemployment in Middleham has increased since 1980. At the end of 1982, there were some 13,000 registered unemployed in the Middleham Employment Office area. This figure rose to 13,505 in 1984, but has fallen to 12,748 in February, 1987. This figure represents 8% of those living in the borough who are available for work.

The proportion of unemployed men to unemployed women is nearly twice as large as in previous years. Middleham unemployment rate has remained below the average for Outer London and Greater London, and the figure has remained relatively stable. Analysis undertaken in 1986 shows that between 1983 and 1986, the greatest increase in unemployment occurred in the female age groups of 25-34 and 45-54. Significantly, over half those unemployed in Middleham, continued to be under 30 years of age.

Modern development has meant that there is a strong local demand for white collar office workers, the obvious source being that of school leavers. This, in turn, is a significant fact, which we must bear in mind when looking at the functioning of the Middleham education system.

Secondly, school pupils would know that if they obtained the right educational qualification, then there would be employment for them in the Middleham area. Similarly, parents and others might be expected to be very concerned that the education system did its utmost to ensure that their children obtained these qualifications.

3.3 Middleham School Board Inspectorate

The function of Middleham School Board Inspectorate is to improve the quality of education service provided by the authority. The school inspector's work may be classified into broad categories:

(a) To advise members and officers of the authority, and to give them information on the state of educational provision in the area for which the authority is responsible; (b) To provide a service to the authority's school staff by advising and helping them in their professional development. Inspection of schools is made in order to provide information to the sub-committee, while the process of inspection benefits the staff as discussions and suggestions for improving school work are generally made during the inspection and in the report. School inspection, advice and information are, therefore, among the main Middleham school inspector's priorities. All branches of Middleham school inspectors spent a lot of time in schools and colleges observing the kind of education provided, and constantly assessing it, discussing with the staff ways to make them more effective, individually and collectively. After local government reorganisation, emphasis has been shifted to close examination of the quality of education provided in schools, and the development of ideas

for raising children's educational attainment and standards.

Now Middleham inspectorate and schools are faced with the great challenge of helping their pupils to cope with the problems of transition from school to employment, at a time when employment prospects for school leavers are a cause of concern.

3.4 The Core Curriculum

The purpose of this section is to examine the process of core curriculum development in Middleham and the inspector's role in it. An attempt was made by the writer to assess the extent to which the final curriculum document of January 1984 was a product of democratic dialogue, adequately justified and was likely to prove desirable. An agreed curriculum would make it much easier to evaluate, to ensure accountability and, more importantly, to give the Education Committee much greater control.

The Education Committee favoured testing so that they could make sense of examination results which would make it possible for the Authority to exercise some control over standards. It would enable councillors to understand what was happening in their schools and to manage it more purposefully. Agreement would open the way for rational planning, resource allocation, evaluation and innovation. In the view of the Chief Inspector, a consensus curriculum agreed in the public arena would help to protect the service against indiscriminate cuts. An agreed curriculum offered other benefits from the point of view of the LEA. It would help to ensure that

pupils receive essential learning and, along with testing, provide a way of checking that they were fulfilling their potential. The Chairman, the Director and the Chief Inspector were united in their belief that education should be a matter for democratic debate. They wanted to give the consumer, (parents, industry and commerce) a greater say in the education provided.

The negotiation for the core curriculum began in 1982 with the setting up of fourteen working parties, each of which was led by the local education authority inspector. There were subject groups plus committees to look at primary education, multi-cultural education, preparation for adult life, assessment and special needs. Some of these groups were very large and all took part on a voluntary basis. Out of these activities emerged a set of working papers. The Director summarised them and turned them into a consultative document. This was the first attempt at stating the Authority's policy on the curriculum. It was issued in April, 1983 and three months were allowed for comments from all concerned. There was a mass of replies which the Director again summarised in a document. In November, 1983 a 'Conference on the Curriculum' was held and was attended by representatives from all sections of the community. Finally, in January, 1984, the Director produced a statement of policy on the curriculum to be followed in Middleham. This is now LEA policy.

The role of LEA inspectors in the Middleham LEA is an advisory one. Negotiation for the curriculum began with the setting up of the fourteen working parties, each of which was supervised by an

LEA inspector. The statutory basis for the work of LEA inspectors is Section 77, Sub-Section 3 of the Education Act, 1944, which requires any LEA to appoint its own inspectors. Neither the purpose nor the nature of such inspection is defined by the 1944 Act.

Bolam et al (1974) ¹ described the LEA inspectors' role as a dual one. He analysed it along two dimensions - an administrative dimension and a professional dimension:

"In their administrative role, they are in a power-coercive or political-administrative relationship with teachers in schools. They, therefore, inform them about decisions taken by policy-makers and administrators, and evaluate their performance. In their professional role, they are in an empirical-rational relationship with teachers and schools. They, therefore, advise the policy-makers and administrators about the needs and problems of schools and teachers, and seek to improve performance, for example, via in-service training."

Thus, when teachers, policy-makers and administrators consult an inspector, even when the matter concerned is a professional one, they may be aware of his administrative role and this may inhibit their relationship.

3.5 Inspectorial Roles in the Middleham Reform

a) Consultation

When the Director of Education and Council members decided to set up a core curriculum, they consulted the LEA inspectors and sought their advice. This was the first move in the process of consultation. The inspectors then began to consult those who were involved with the school curriculum: teachers, parents, representatives of industry and commerce. Fourteen working parties were set up, each of which was led by an inspector. The first draft of the curriculum statement was based on the Working Party reports and interested parties were allowed three months to respond to it.

According to one senior inspector, the consultation was real enough and teachers and interested parties had plenty of time to reply. The document produced by the Middleham Head Teachers' Association was taken into full consideration. Middleham's curriculum conference was unique. It gathered together a wide range of people from within the Borough and a number of Authorities from outside it. There were head teachers, parents, community group leaders, and representatives from industry and commerce. The Conference was organised by LEA inspectors. They convened the meetings and drew up the agenda and offered their professional advice: to policy-makers, administrators, teachers and parents.

The Director, in his interview held on the 21st March, 1984, felt that the final curriculum document was the product of consensus.

He argued that there was plenty of agreement with the teaching profession about contents which derived from a variety of sources, including: examination, teacher-training and tradition. In his view, the final document was basically written by the teachers who took part in the Working Parties. He also stated that one must not lose sight of the fact that the councillors were elected and could claim to have had a democratic 'mandate' for the broad shape and direction of their curriculum policy.

On the other hand, the picture looked rather different from the point of view of a number of teachers and head teachers. Their reservations related to various aspects of the process, the general conduct of working parties, the role of LEA inspectors; their attitudes, their treatment of teachers and the speed with which changes were forced through. It might be necessary to look at some of these and the criticisms associated with them.

Turning to the setting up of the working parties, critics pointed out that there was no working party to discuss the curriculum as a whole. Several head teachers pointed out that meetings were controlled by the convening inspectors who drew up the agenda. A head teacher who attended the 'assessment working party' claimed that certain issues were not allowed to be raised. For example, what kinds of tests were proposed and views were often dismissed by the wishes of the elected members.

Turning to the Conference of 1983, some critics felt it was a cosmetic exercise. The NUT described it as "window dressing and a public relation exercise." After the conference, the final statement of policy issued in January, 1984 was rapidly produced. This speed of approach was criticised for rendering consultation inadequate. It was felt that LEA inspectors were rushing through a cluster of developments and that this was not aiding consultation.

Finally, one might ask whether the final curriculum document reflected a consensus viewpoint. Some people felt it consisted of guidelines, rather than prescriptions. On page three of the final document, it was stated:

"that the policies described in this statement are binding on all schools."

This statement could be interpreted as prescription, rather than guideline. Above all, despite the enormous concerns expressed by unions, teachers and head teachers about blanket testing of pupils at 8, 11, and 14, this was to go ahead.

b) Justification

The concept of justification has a number of features. It is an ethical matter rooted in principles of democracy and reason. A variety of responses was made to the question asking whether the LEA inspectors were justified in allowing a curriculum policy to be formulated. It was the inspector's role to advise the LEA on such

policy. The question was interpreted to be asking whether greater participation in curriculum decision was justified and some agreed that it was. According to one inspector:

"Society should have much greater influence on the curriculum through its elected representatives."

Several inspectors felt that parents and industry should be involved in the shapening of the aims of the curriculum. On the other hand, it was felt that, although a framework reflecting the views of the wider community was justified, one which was simply an expression of the preference of the councillors was not. Two reasons were given for this. One was fear of political indoctrination and the other was that members lacked sufficient expertise. In the view of some inspectors, education is a partnership in which the LEA has a role to produce broad aims for the curriculum.

To some extent, justification relied on the legal nature of the document. An appeal to pegality is implicitly an appeal to democracy. On page three of the Curriculum Document 1984, it states that:

"The policies described in this statement are binding on all schools and the Authority may require schools whose curricula and syllabus do not conform to alter them."

This clearly implies that the LEA has the legal power to lay down a curriculum policy, and to enforce it.

Setting aside issues of legality and democracy, are there any other ways in which the LEA or the school inspectors attempted to justify the curriculum policy? To what extent is a clear justification offered? The final curriculum document provides the answer. The statement of policy makes a number of assertions, but does not attempt to justify them in any detail.

On page four, it is stated:

"The authority believes that there are certain experiences, skills and areas of knowledge which are basic and essential. They are essential because they are necessary for successful living in today's society."

This notion of successful living is important, but it is not explained or justified.

To summarise, the statement of policy does not offer an explicit justification for what it stipulates. Instead, it relies on a mixture of appeals to the authority of the central government, LEA inspectors, to the authority's own electoral standing, and by implication of the law. In addition, the document draws on certain authorities, which themselves failed to offer some justification. There is a sense in which the document assumes that we all know what we are talking about. So there is no need to be precise or explicit.

c) Desirability

It is necessary to set aside the question of whether the policy is adequately justified to turn to the question of desirability. The acid test, in this context, would be the extent to which desirable changes occurred in schools, particularly in classrooms. Will the policy improve the quality of education provided? Core curriculum in Middleham needs to be seen in relation to plans for pupils testing, teachers assessment and broad desires for accountability and control. It is an approach to improving the quality of education.

It may be best to begin by identifying and assessing what many see as Middleham's emerging strategy for change. Control of curriculum design and development was seen to be shifting into the hands of LEA inspectors. The local inspectorate was still being regarded, but was seen to have a new role. It was seen to be less interested in subjective data and more interested in hard evidence, less pastoral and supportive, while becoming tougher.

Within schools, the role of the head is changing. He or she is expected to take more administrative responsibility, while giving up a degree of professional autonomy with respect to curriculum content. Some head teachers pointed out the increase in the amount of paper work that they were involved with. They were required to develop written proposals, e.g. for Math's scheme in primary schools. The performance of schools was also being closely

scrutinized, and the proposed testing would be used to assist in interpreting the examination results of pupils. The emphasis of the strategy seemed to be: managerial skills, objective measurement, the value of written roles, remedies and proposals, and a system of direction, accountability and control.

Before looking at the content of the curriculum document, it may be worthwhile to assess the extent to which it will operate as a restrictive or a liberating influence. One secondary head was quite clear about this, saying:

"I do not feel threatened by the document
and in no way does the document restrict
what is happening in our curriculum, in
fact it is supportive."

Many others felt that, in various ways, the document would be a limiting factor.

Firstly, there is the obvious danger that once something is written down, it may be seen as the final answer and becomes frozen and static. One head teacher felt that the detail subject guidelines might narrow teachers' approaches to their subjects and discourage them from adopting broader perspectives. Teachers and head teachers were of the opinion that blanket testing, particularly of young pupils, was both inappropriate and likely to narrow the curriculum. Given these fears, most head teachers felt that the curriculum had little impact in schools. The inspectors felt that

the core curriculum would act as a liberating factor; that its impact in schools would bring about many changes.

It is necessary to look more closely at the curriculum and its proposal for core. It consists of a strategy which details the authority's aim, principles and responsibilities. On page four, it is stated:

"The authority believes that there are certain experiences, skills and areas of knowledge which are basic and essential, and which should be present in a balance and coherent way throughout each year of the compulsory schooling of pupils; basic in the sense that they provide a necessary foundation for other learning and further study; essential because they are necessary for successful living in today's society."

The document is largely concerned with specifying core content, rather than core processes. It is not entirely clear what schools are supposed to include in their core curricula or how a balance between the various elements is to be achieved. For example, on page eleven, it is implied that schools must offer certain examination subjects, but it does not say that option policies should ensure that a balanced combination is chosen or what balance should look like.

It is necessary to conclude this section by pointing out the various ways in which the core curriculum may prove beneficial. It may enable councillors to make better use of existing resources.

It may provide protective barriers against arbitrary cuts in public spending. LEA inspectors agreed that the curriculum policy could improve the performance of schools in a number of ways:

- a) Some schools need to be pushed to broaden their curricula;
 - b) it ensures continuity between the stages of education;
 - c) it may help schools to introduce more structure into the curriculum;
 - d) by forcing schools to justify change, it may improve the quality of change.
- d) Independence

The LEA inspectors, unlike HMI inspectors, are not independent. They are agents of the teachers' employers, that is the LEA.

With regards to Middleham curriculum policy, the role of LEA inspectors was to do what the authority wanted them to do. Whether what is done is desirable or not, is not their concern. Their role is to advise the authority and its schools. Turning to the desirability of the curriculum policy for change, the first point is that the authority wanted to bring about rapid change. Schools left to their own have been very slow to adjust to changing circumstances.

LEA inspectors had been consulted to bring this about. Under pressure, curricula might be clarified and aims and objectives structured and sharpened.

The role structuring could bring a number of benefits. It might ensure that teachers, heads and inspectors were clear about what was expected of them, and this would improve performance all round. It would enable the head teacher to perform more effectively and to get more out of staff. A Staff Appraisal Scheme would ensure that heads know their staff, and that talented individuals are spotted and promoted quickly, and this would benefit the schools.

3.6 The Methodology of Participant Observation

The writer decided to employ the research technique of participant observation.²

a) General Background to Participant Observation

"It is probably misleading to regard participant observation as a single method. Rather, it refers to a characteristic blend or combination of methods and techniques that is employed in studying certain types of subject matter: primitive societies, deviant sub-cultures, complex organisations (such as hospitals, unions, corporations), social movements, communities and informal groups (such as gangs and factory workers groups). This characteristic blend of techniques involves some amount of social interaction in the field with the subject of the study, some direct observation of relevant events, some formal and a great deal of informal interviewing, some systematic counting, some collection of documents and artifacts, and open-endedness in the direction the study takes."³

Because of the quality of this blend called participant observation, it has not lent itself to the standardization of procedure that social scientists have come to expect of their methods, as in testing and surveys.

Profound questions of reliability, validity and generality of results have thus been raised, injecting terms such as observer's bias, personal equation, going native, and hearsay, into the literature of the social sciences:

"The techniques of participant observation are regarded as difficult to communicate or to teach. The non-quantitative nature of the results causes difficulty in presenting evidence and proof for the propositions. Critics deride participant observation as a romantic attempt to get close to the data, which attempts gives rise to a host of ethical problems concerning the human rights and interests of the subjects, in relation to the study." ⁴

Proponents of participant observation, on the other hand, have sometimes championed it as being less likely than other methods to be biased, unreliable or invalid, because it provides more internal checks of more direct nature, and is more responsive to the data than are the imposed systems of other methods. Moreover, according to such proponents:

"participant observation is not restricted to static cross-sectional data, but allows real study of social processes and complex inter-dependencies in social systems. Therefore, they consider the data of participant observation richer and more direct." ⁵

The nature of these criticisms, claims and counter-claims should provide the researcher with a clue to the underlying reason for the heat generated by the controversy over participant observation - namely, this controversy is the major residue of the two great methodological issues which sharply divided sociologists during the formative period of 1920-1930.⁶ The issues, persisting today, were disputes over the merits of case studies versus statistics and over the concept of subjective interpretation. An easy truce was struck in these disputes, to the effect that case studies (not so much of individuals as of organisations or communities) could still be usefully done, as studies, but that as methods the case study was not as scientifically impressive and advantageous as the statistical method. Similarly, subjective data from the subject, such as motives and intentions, were admitted to good standing in the field so long as they were classified and counted. Indeed, these could be made the basis for a theoretical interpretation of certain statistical relationships between other types of facts.

In this chapter, it is hoped to assemble and discuss the major methodological issues on participant observation, focussing rather on concrete issues of method and techniques. It makes little sense to be-little or champion participant observation; it will be better to study the methods and techniques involved so that better use may be made of them in producing scientific information.

In order to facilitate this study, a sketch will be made in this chapter of a view of the nature of participant observation.

To begin, let us recall the view that participant observation is most sensibly regarded as the blend of methods and techniques that is characteristically employed in studies of social situations or complex social organisations of all sorts. These are studies that involve repeated, genuine social interaction on the scene, with the subjects themselves as a part of data gathering process. That is, participant observation is viewed not as a single method, but as a type of research enterprise, a style of combining several methods toward a particular end. That end is an analytic description of a complex social organisation (primitive band, criminal gang, occupational group, mental hospital, or the like). An analytical description: a) employs the concepts, propositions and empirical generalisations of a body of scientific theory as the basic guidelines in analysis and reporting; b) employs thorough and systematic collection, classification and reporting of facts; c) generates new empirical generalisation based on these data.

Thus, an analytic description is primarily an empirical application and modification of scientific theory, rather than an efficient and powerful test of such a theory. This is not to say that participant observation studies cannot be used to test theory. That test of theory comes in comparing such analytic descriptions of complex cases when these are available in sufficient number and variety. Anthropologists test theories by comparing analytic descriptions of societies and community sociologists by comparing community studies.⁷ Note that these tests cannot be made by

comparing careful analytic descriptions of the types described above.

One important reason for the insistence on analytic descriptions is that social scientists conceive of these complex social organisations as being largely latent organisations - largely unintended and unrecognised by the members themselves, and therefore not apparent to or describeable by laymen (including the actual members).⁸ Because many of the features of organisations are not recognised by the members, they cannot report them, even when carefully questioned by a skilled social science interviewer. Consequently, in order to obtain an analytic description, the scientist himself must observe the organisation directly. Even to the trained eye of the scientist, many of the features are not readily apparent and emerge only through systematic classification, enumeration and comparison of particular facts.

Although direct observation is thus necessary, it alone is not sufficient to enable the scientist to obtain a thorough description. Among other reasons, three particularly stand out:

- a) the organisation is typically being manifested in several localities simultaneously;
- b) the organisation has typically been in existence for some time before the scientist undertook his study;

c) many of its features or determinants (such as the motives, intentions, interests and perceptions of its members), are only imperfectly inferable by direct observation. From reasons a) and b), there follows the need to supplement the scientist's direct observation with indirect observation, which can only be obtained from perceptive persons who were on the scene in the scientist's absence. These persons, called informants, must be carefully questioned by the scientist in order to piece together the particular facts of the events from which the scientist himself was absent. In order to avoid a casual or misleading account, the informant must not be allowed to report mere impressions or his own subjective generalisations; he must report hard particular facts so that the scientist can form his own, often quite different, generalisations.

One very important class of "informants" or "surrogate observers" are the various records and documents pertaining to the organisation, such as budgetary records, rule books, minutes of meetings, personal files, diaries etc., which record certain facts and events that the scientist was unable to observe directly. The third reason (mentioned above) for the insufficiency of direct observation alone - that some features of an organisation are only imperfectly inferable from direct observation - emphasises the need for yet another technique: interviewing the members or participants concerning their motives, their intentions and their interpretation of events in question. This provides a critical

check on the validity of some, but not all, types of inferences made by the scientist. Such interviewing of the interviewee, not in the role of a substituted scientist-observer, but merely in the role of himself, reporting his own personal behaviour and thoughts:

"This is the role of respondent as in ordinary survey interviewing and is to be contrasted with the role of informant. (Note that any one person may, at the same time, perform the role of respondent and at other times, perform the role of informant). In checking inferences concerning, say, the motives of a certain category of participants, it should be obvious that the scientist must not employ informant interviewing but must resort to respondent interviewing of a suitably drawn sample from the category involved." 9

As another check on the feelings and thoughts of the members of the organisation under study, the scientist himself may take active part in the relevant activities - taking drugs, taking classes, driving a truck, dancing in a tribal rite. By doing so, he receives the same socialization as ordinary members, acquires similar perspectives, and encountered similar experiences. In this way, the scientist acquires some sense of the subjective side of the events which he could not readily infer if he observed without taking part.

As already stated, a number of techniques - direct observation, informant interviewing, document analysis, respondents' interviewing and direct participation - typically, and to some degree necessarily

involved in a field study of any complex social organisation. Each of these techniques is important for obtaining a particular type of information.

b) Aspects of Participant Observation

i) Participant Observer Methodology

The participant observer methodology is qualitative, rather than quantitative research. Instead of studying some social phenomenon as an "outsider", the participant observer attempts to approach knowledge by becoming an "insider", and by being a part of the social reality of the individuals and groups he is studying. He attempts to discover and explain some particular group perspective by assuming the role of a group member and by taking part in the construction of that perspective.

The purpose of participant observer study is to develop some understanding of group perspectives and individual relationships in complex social settings. The participant observer methodology reduces the gap between researcher and subjects. The researcher's role is defined as less unlike his subject than in ordinary quantified research. He is not limited to looking at the covariance of isolated factors. He becomes part of the ongoing group dynamics and he studies the process as well as the product of the group interaction. According to Bogdan, this methodological approach directs itself at human settings and the individuals in them. He claims that the subject of the study, be it an organisation or

individual, is not reduced to isolated variables or hypotheses but rather an attempt is made to look at it in context, from a comprehensive perspective.¹⁰

The initial task of the participant observer is to establish himself as an insider so that he may participate in the activity of his subjects, and understand the reality they create through their shared activities. According to Cusick, the researcher assumes that his fellow participants in the social setting actually form their own social reality and that in order to understand it, he should take part in the creation:

"The information gathering procedure is based on the assumption that any group of individuals will develop a reasonable way of behaving in their environment and if one wishes to understand that he can do so by joining them, submitting himself to the routine, rules and regulations that structure their world, and recording everything that goes on."¹¹

ii) Symbolic Interpretation

Implicit in the participant observer methodology is the concept that individuals interact and create a social consensus which they define as reality, something which they believe to actually exist. Man is considered to be a social creature who, as he interacts with others, acquires beliefs and patterns of behaviour that allow him to derive a measure of satisfaction from his environment. These

beliefs and behaviour are not static but are redefined in a continual process of interaction among individuals in an ever-changing social environment.

The redefinitions of reality take place within the context of organisational setting. The organisation establishes guidelines for group interaction, and the norms and behaviours developed by the informal group reflect the formal structure of the organisation in which they exist. According to Perror, the explanation for organisational behaviour is not primarily in the formal structure of the organisation, but lies in the myriad of subterraneous processes of informal groups. A study of student groups and group interaction, for example, not only produces information about the informal network of the student sub-culture, but also indicates how these groups influence the formal structure of the students.¹²

By their actions and interactions, men create a sub-society with its own goals, norms and standard behaviour. In order to understand the reality generated by the group, it is necessary to understand the interaction of its members. Some sociologists contend that human beings do not directly respond to each other's actions, but first interpret the actions and the response on the basis of the interpretation.¹³ This ongoing process of definition and interpretation is referred to as "symbolic interpretation". The term "symbolic interpretation" refers to particular and distinctive character of interpretation as it takes place between human beings.

The peculiarity consists in the fact the human beings interpret or define each other's actions. Their response is not made directly to the actions of one another, but instead is based on the meaning which they attach to such actions. Thus, human interaction is mediated by the use of symbols by interpretations or by ascertaining the meaning of one another's actions.¹⁴

Symbolic interactionists consider the human group to be a developing social element. As the members interpret and respond to the actions of others, they establish patterns of joint action and norms. They also allow for the transformation of the action and norms by their continual interaction. In order to understand this dynamic group process, it must be perceived through the eyes of an insider. According to Blumer:

"The study of an action would have to be made from the position of the actor. Such action is forged by the actor out of what he perceives, interprets and judges; one would have to see the operating situation as the actor interprets them."¹⁵

The participant observer methodology enables the researcher to perceive the social situation as the actors perceive it; but he is not only a participant in the group, in his role as a scientific observer, he must also account for and explain the actions of his fellow participants.

iii) The Participant Observer in the Field

In order to describe the group processes, the researcher must become an actor in the social setting. He must experience the same pressures and periodic exigencies as the individuals and groups he is studying. According to Gold, there are four basic roles that the participant observer may assume while doing field research:

Complete Participant: The true identity of the complete participant in the field research is not known to those whom he observes. The complete participant engages in role pretense.

Observer-as-Participant: This role is used in studies involving one visit interviews. It calls for relatively more formal observation than either informal observation.

Participant-as-Observers: Both field worker and the subjects of the study are aware that there is a field relationship. The field worker's presence is known, but he attempts to be a normal and acceptable member of the group he is studying.

Complete Observer: The complete observer's role entirely removes the field worker from social interaction with informants. Here a field worker attempts to observe people in ways which make it unnecessary for them to take him into account. ¹⁶

3.7 Types of Information

Various types of information are combined into three broad classes:

a) Incidents and Histories. A log of events during a given period, a record of conversations heard, a description of a wedding, a funeral, an election etc., not only the actions observed, but the meanings, the explanations etc. reported by the participants, can be regarded as part of the incidents insofar as they are thought of as data, rather than actual explanations.

b) Distributions and Frequencies. Possessions of each member of S, number of members who have a given belief, number of times member m is observed talking to member n etc.

c) Generally Known Rules and Statuses. Lists of statuses, lists of persons occupying them, informants' accounts of how rules of exogamy apply, how incest or descent are defined, how political leaders are supposed to be chosen.

3.8 Sampling

Unlike the procedures in many other types of research, sampling in participant observation studies is not designed and executed in advance of data collection, but is continually carried on throughout the study. For example, a sample is drawn, of variables, indicators, informants, respondents or whatever. The study of these typically gives rise to further ideas or hypotheses on the part of the observer,

and these then lead him to draw still further samples of different sorts in order to pursue the emerging ideas. As a consequence, participant observers can seldom prescribe their samples in advance, but can only describe and justify them after the fact.

Nonetheless, there are at least three general types of sampling procedures which the observer can indicate in advance that he may employ. The first of these is some sort of quota sample, in which, for example, the observer is aware of certain formal categories of organisation members and he determines beforehand that he will interview and observe at least a few persons from each of these categories. Having done so, he will often modify and add to these categories of persons so that he now has a new set of categories from which to sample. This new sample will typically give rise to still further categories of persons and events, and this may occur several more times.

A second type of sampling procedure often employed in participant observation is the snowball sample, in which, for example, choosing one informant may generate information about other persons which leads the observer to contact one of these others as second informant, who in turn direct him to a third informant, etc. in an extensive chain of contacts.

A third type, employed when empirical relationships have been hypothesised is the search for exception to such relationships. If, for example, advanced medical students are thought to be

cynical concerning medical training while first-year students are idealistic, the observer might probe for any remaining idealistic attitudes or persons among the older students, and for cynicism among the older students and for cynicism among the younger in order to try more strenuously the validity of the hypothesis.¹⁷

These procedures are not restricted to any particular type of content, nor are they the only sampling procedure that may be employed in random sampling techniques, for instance, with all their attendant advantages, may sometimes be applicable, particularly in sampling respondents.

What is being sampled? The two most important decisions in a participant observation study are determining the specific organisation or situation to be investigated and the substantive topic of research. It appears that the organisation (United Nations) may be chosen before the topic (socialization or power dynamics). In these cases, the organisation is typically chosen, either because one is offered an exceptional opportunity of access to it, or because one is fascinated by the organisation and is willing to study almost any aspect of it. The reverse sequence - choosing first a topic and then an organisation in which to study it - appears more rational on the face of things, but the history of the sciences reveals that each sequence in comparable degree has generated useful theory and data.¹⁸

These sequences do present somewhat differing problems of selection, however. If one is primarily committed to a topic, such as the influence of stratification on decision-making, then the selection of the specific organisation to be studied should be made ideally in terms of systematically augmenting out the types of organisation that have already been studied, with respect to that topic. For example, if all the previous studies have dealt with one - industry, cities and rural trading communities, one might well choose to study a small two industry city. Of course, the further choice of a specific city from this category will ordinarily turn on less abstract criteria of accessibility, convenience, etc.

If, on the other hand, one is primarily committed to studying the specific organisation, then, the choice of topic is typically made in terms of the investigator's frame of reference, and of the sorts of topics studied by others in similar contexts. For example, a researcher who becomes involved in studying a particular delinquent gang will normally have strong dispositions toward a handful of topics pertinent to such an organisation.

In general, however, choosing the organisation in terms of the topic, tends to be associated with theory testing, whereas choosing the topic in terms of the organisation, favours description and discovery of theory.

Regardless of which variables may be selected for investigation, the means of measuring these variables must be chosen from a number

of alternative means. Any empirical concept or measure, if it is to be useful scientifically, must suggest certain events or properties that serve as indicators of the presence, or measure of the magnitude of that concept or variable.¹⁹ Supposing that middle-class norms had been defined, the application of these middle-class norms to scholastically unsuccessful boys could be detected, among many other ways by looking up any school regulations concerning dress and hair styles, by asking the boys what is expected of them by their teachers, or by asking their teachers what they are hoping for in these boys' performances. Any or all of these indicators might be employed, but all too often participant observers neglect to specify what indicators they actually employed or still worse, they fail to employ them in a systematic way. For example, in one case, the researcher might use one of the indicators, but in another case within the same study, he might employ a different indicator of the same variable. The comparability of the two cases on the same variable, thus becomes problematical.

One should not convey the impression that consistency of use is the only important criterion in the selection of indicators or measures. Among other important criteria are the comparative validity, reliability, precision and economy of the possible means of assessing the presence or magnitude of the given variable.

3.9 Establishing Field Relations

Because the relationship between the research worker and the persons in the field is the key to effective observation and interviewing, much depends on the initial field contacts. They often determine whether the door to research will be open or shut.

Although each field setting has its own peculiar characteristic to be taken into account, a few rough principles guiding entry into the field are worth noting.

a) Generally, field contacts should move from persons in the highest status and authority positions down to the actual participants in the field situation one wants to study. Where there are two lines of authority, early contacts with leaders of both groups may be essential to prevent either from identifying the researcher as partisan. Top leaders are often in the best position to have the vision and perspective to understand what the research is trying to accomplish. Once they have offered co-operation, persons further down the hierarchy will generally go along with the research if they are properly approached.

b) The field worker needs to have a plausible explanation of the research, that makes sense to the people whose co-operation he seeks. While this sounds obvious, it is not an easy thing to provide. If informants get the impression that they are going to be carefully scrutinized in all they do and perhaps compared to others, resistance may develop. Compare the following explanations:

We want to study what makes
for good and bad union
leadership.

We want to learn what the
roots of active political
organisation are -

We are interested in racial
tension, discrimination and
prejudice and how they are
related to each other in the
community.

We want to learn how a
union carries on its day-
to-day work.

We want to understand how a
local political party goes
about a campaign.

We are interested in the
different groups that make
up a city like this -
Jewish community, the Negro.

This principle underlies the better examples above: the researcher should indicate interest in understanding the legitimate activities of a person or group, rather than evaluating them. Field workers who do not give careful thought to the explanation of their research in advance, even to the selection of specific phrases they will use, often find themselves turned down.

c) The field worker should try to represent himself, his sponsors, and his study as honestly as possible. Bluffing, pretending naively, misrepresenting oneself, or one's sponsors, or pretending that the study is more or less important than is the case, are all dangerous tactics. Subsequent events or other sources of information may bring to light the real situation and seriously damage relations. Further research may become impossible.

d) As the first research step, the field worker should have in mind some rather routine fact-gathering that makes sense to those in the field. This will prove him with an acceptable reason for contacting people where he wants to work. Gathering these facts will give others

an opportunity to become accustomed to his presence and will generate contact for further inquiry. Acceptance of the field worker depends more upon the kind of person he is, than the perceived value of his research. Informants want to be assured that the researcher is a "good-guy" and can be trusted with what he uncovered. They are not usually interested in the complete rationale for the study. The researcher should not, of course, appear reticent in talking about his study; a willingness to tell people more about the study than they want to know allays fears and suspicion.

The field worker's aim is to participate naturally with the group he is studying. He would probably retain his identity as a researcher. He hopes this will give him greater understanding of its members and of their social circumstances. At first, the presence of an outsider may seriously inhibit behaviour. But as he comes fully accepted, others will behave quite spontaneously in his presence. Acceptance depends in part on the field worker having an appropriate role in the eyes of the informants.

e) Acceptance depends upon time spent in the field, a legitimate role in the eyes of the informants, and the expression of a genuine interest in the people being studied. Therefore, the researcher should sacrifice initial data in order to speed acceptance. He should not be eager to collect crucial data, instead, he should let circumstances carry him along. He should not give the impression that his only reason for being there is to collect data, but that genuinely he enjoys the

informant's company, and is interested in the activities of the group. He should avoid constant probing with questions - he is better advised to inject his questions or comments when the conversation turns to his area of concern. In general, the field worker progresses from passive observation, to participation in group activities, to interviewing and finally to experimentation. Trying to move too quickly from one phase to the next can destroy good working relations and delay data collection.²⁰

3.10 The Research Model for Middleham

The main purpose of the study was to explore the school inspector's perception of time spent on some activities of his role. The two main purposes of the observation were as follows: First, it was designed to obtain three types of data about the sample of inspectors: biological and career information, an account of what their role involved, their views on their job. Second, it was hoped to obtain information in carrying out the interview stage. It was decided to employ the research methodology of participant observation. This allowed the researcher to get closer to the quality of data by becoming an "insider". The two project stages were as follows: There was the participant observation of four school inspectors in Middleham. Secondly, there were research interviews with fifteen school inspectors in the same LEA.

a) Data Collection

In participant observation studies, data collection is not a distinct phase in the research process, but rather is one distinguishable aspect of the process: design analysis and write-up are also being carried out simultaneously with data collection. One study emphasised direct observation and another stressed informant interviewing, and another leaned upon respondent interviewing, and so on. But in virtually every case, all the five techniques were employed in some varying proportion. The relative role which each one plays in a given study depends not only on the personal preferences of the researcher, but also on the relative importance of the type of data for which each is best suited. Data for this study were collected from the following sources:

b) Direct Observation

This is the archetypical technique of scientific inquiry. If one seeks to know and understand what exists or what is happening, the common-sense impulse is to go and look at it closely and repeatedly. Some topics of investigation, however, do not lend themselves to this sort of direct observation. Many events take place in a setting from which the observer is prohibited.

Direct observation is indispensable in obtaining certain types of data. For example, where the actors are strongly motivated to distort information in order to justify their own behaviours or where the actors will not communicate facts. Therefore, in order to obtain analytic description, the observer should observe directly.

Although direct observation is necessary, it alone is not sufficient to enable the researcher to obtain a thorough description. There followed the need to supplement direct observation with indirect observation which can only be obtained by perceptive persons or informants.

c) Informant Interviewing is the technique chosen to seek information on events that occur infrequently or are not open to direct observation by the researcher, for whatever reason. It is also an economical means of learning the details and meaning of institutionalised practices and norms with which the informant is familiar by dint of considerable experience. One important class of informant or surrogate observers is the various records and documents pertaining to the organisation such as the rule book, personal files, diaries which record certain facts and events that could not be observed directly.

d) Respondent Interviewing

Another reason for the insufficiency of direct observation emphasised the need for yet another technique: respondent interviewing for interviewing the members or participants concerning their motives, their intentions and their interpretation of events in question. This provides critical checks on the validity on the type of inferences made by the researcher. Respondent interviewing is employed when the information sought concerned the personal feelings, perceptions, motives or intentions of the interviewees. Here, it is the person rather than events, that is of interest to the researcher.

e) Document Analysis is employed in a situation similar to interviewing both the informant and respondent. Certain documents such as official statistics and reports are used like informants to establish facts about events which the researcher was unable to observe directly.

f) Direct Participation

As another check on the feelings and thoughts of the members, the researcher himself may take active part in the relevant activities. By doing so, he receives the same sociolization as ordinary members, acquired similar perspectives and encountered similar experiences. Data obtained from direct participation are verified by observation or interviewing other relevant actors, and not merely assumed to hold for them.

Given the relevant importance of each of the various types of information to a participant observation study, the use of the relevant technique is proportional to the utility in obtaining such information. For example, when cultural norms are the main type of information desired, informant interviewing is the predominant technique.

g) Exploratory Questions

The research was conducted with the following exploratory questions in mind:

i) What was the nature of the school inspector's role?

ii) What was it like to observe the inspector's role from the perspective of the inspector?

iii) What were the inspector's concerns and fears? What were their hopes and aspirations?

Guided by a series of exploratory questions, this researcher was able to investigate the inspector's role from the perspective of the inspector.

3.11 The Observation Stage

a) The Sample

It was clear from the outset that the LEAs would have to provide the basis for the sampling of inspectors. Two considerations made this necessary. First, the views of individual inspectors had to be interpreted in the context of LEAs structure within which they worked. For resource reasons, it made sense to limit the number of LEAs about which the information was to be collected.

Second, it was impossible to select a country-wide sample of inspectors on the basis of job specification or status. Accurate and detailed information about the number and type of inspectorial staff in each LEA was not widely available. References to such

publication as the Education Authority Director and the Education Committee Year Book gave only a rough indication of the number of inspectors in each LEA, and only a scant information as to the type of job they held.

An early decision was thus taken to identify a sample of LEAs and to ask some of their inspectors for some observation and interviews. In this way, comparisons might be possible between LEAs and inspectors in them. The sample of LEAs was drawn as follows: Because of the project limited resources, it was decided that a maximum of 20 LEAs should be approached in the hope of obtaining co-operation from at least three. Ideally, it would have been desirable to select a sample of LEA representation along the dimension felt to be crucial to the inspector's role, e.g. size of LEA, that is, population and area; type of LEA, e.g. urban and rural; size of inspectorial teams; structure of inspectorial team. There was no possibility of discovering much of this information before embarking on the project. These dimensions, although important, could not therefore be taken into account when selecting the sample.

b) Purpose of the Observation

Two main purposes of the observation were: It was designed to obtain three types of data about the sample of inspectors: biological and career information; an account of what their role involved. It was hoped to obtain information in carrying out the interview stage.

3.12 The Interview Stage

a) The Sample

The selection of the interview sample was fixed by an appreciation of basic data from the observation, the travelling consideration and the willingness of inspectors to co-operate in the project. In the event, only one LEA and its 15 inspectors agreed to co-operate. Fifteen interviews were held between the beginning of November and the middle of December, 1984.

The sample of fifteen interviewees was composed of one chief inspector and one senior inspector, plus two with assistant status, and two district co-ordinators. There were four inspectors who combined area duties with responsibility for a level or stage of education. There were five who combined responsibility for a group of schools with subject specialism. The specialist subjects covered included music, primary science, religious education, physical education, drama, craft, home economics, science and mathematics.

The innovative aspect of the inspector's role provided a narrow focus for the interview than a broad attempt at job specification. The link man was a term commonly used by respondents in this study, showing their perception of a role which required not only professional expertise, but facility as a boundary agent between school and education office; attempting to match needs with resources, both in ideas and material, whether from inside or out of the LEA system. This view of the inspector and advisor as a boundary or link agent was basic to the construction of the interview schedule.

A schedule was, therefore, devised which would enable the interviewer to explore the working contacts of inspectors with LEA, HMI, inspectorial colleagues and outside agents. Inspectors were invited to identify the strategies through which they brought about changes in schools, and provide examples of innovations in which they had been involved recently.

Some biographical information about the respondents was already known from observation. The interview supplemented this by exploring motives for entering the inspectorial profession, and eliciting some assessment of job satisfaction. A fairly detailed schedule was devised for a structured interview which took two hours. After much revision, the schedule was tested in six trial interviews in the authorities which were excluded from the sample.

3.13 Time Spent Scale

The most difficult problem was deciding which scale to adopt for the core questions. Finally, two broad scales were adopted: (i) actual amount of time spent on the task area, and (ii) the amount of time which the inspector would prefer to spend on it.

Several alternatives were tried first, but experience indicated these to be less satisfactory, usually because they were more ambiguous. Actual and preferred degree of involvement in a task area was one; actual and preferred degree of responsibility was a second rejected scale. The time spent scale was judged to be more

satisfactory than the alternatives. The experience of interpreting questions led to some modifications in the scale design, that is, a large, fair and small amount of time.

A comprehensive list of tasks undertaken by LEA inspectors was produced by reference to the following documents: DES 1967; NAIEO 1968; Taylor 1973, and Rayner 1983.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. Bolam, R., Smith, G., and Canter, H: Local Education Authority Advisers and the Mechanisms of Innovation, Bristol, NFER Co. Ltd., 1978.
2. The writer is indebted to the Anthropology Department of University College, London, for personal advice on techniques of participant observation.
3. Some writers would prefer to call this broad blend "field work", serving the term participant observation for the technique in which the scientist virtually performs the role of a genuine member and counts as very critical data his resulting subjective experience, which provide leads to be pursued by interviewing his fellow participants.
4. Bogdan, R., Participant Observation in Organisational Setting, Syracuse, New York, Syracuse University Press, 1982, p.1.
5. *ibid*, p.5.
6. Hinkle, R.C., and Hinkle, G.J., The Development of Modern Sociology, New York, Random House, 1954.
7. Eggan, F., "Social Anthropology and the Method of Controlled Comparison", American Anthropologist, 56, pp.743-763, New York Free Press, 1954.
8. Merton, R.K., Social Theory and Social Structure, New York: Free Press, 1957.
9. Kish, L., Survey Sampling, pp.53-111. New York: Wiley, 1954.

10. Bogdan, R., Participant Observation in Organisational Setting, Syracuse University Press, 1982, p.15.
11. Gusick, P.A., Inside High School, New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1982, p.v.
12. Perrow, C., Complex Organisation, Illinois, Scott Foreman and Co. , 1981, p.180.
13. Blumer, H., Sociological Implications of the Thought of George H. Mead, American Journal of Sociology, Vol.LXXI, March 1981, p.537. New York: Social Science Research Council, 1981.
14. Blumer, H., Society as Symbolic Interaction, in: Human Behaviour and Social Process, edited by Arnold Rose, New York, 1981, p.45, S.C.R.C.
15. Blumer, H., Sociological Implications of the Thought of George Mead, op.cit., p.542.
16. Gold, R., Roles in Field Observation, in: Sociological Method, edited by: Norman K. Denzin, New York: American Research Council, 1971.
17. ibid, p.112.
18. ibid, p.114.
19. Lazarsfeld, P.F., 'Evidence and Inference in Social Research', in: Daniel, L. (ed), Evidence and Inference, pp.53-111, New York: Free Press, 1959.

20. *ibid*, p.115.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESEARCH FINDINGS

4.1 Introduction

In order to get an over-view of which activities the group of inspectors felt were most and least important, the alphabetical ratings of A, B, and C were turned into numerical ratings: C representing a small amount of time was given a score of 1, while A, standing for a large amount of time was given a score of 3.

It was then possible to compile mean ratings by combining the scores of all the fifteen members of the inspectorate team and dividing the total by fifteen. This produced two sets of twenty-two ratings, one set for the actual amount of time spent and the second set for the preferred amount of time spent. These are given in columns one and three of the table. It could be seen by examining these columns that most of the items had a higher rating for the preferred amount of time compared to the actual amount of time. This made it difficult to understand what the relative priorities of the inspectors collectively were. In order to clarify this, particularly from the point of view of seeing if there were only conflicts between the actual amount of time spent and the preferred amount of time spent, the ratings have been turned into ranks, with the highest rating representing most time being given a rank of one. The ranks for actual and preferred amount of time

were given in columns two and four respectively. How did the inspectors see their actual role? If we rank order, the different activities according to the actual amount of time spent on them, we get a rather mixed picture.

Looking at the table, we can see that the most important activities from the point of view of time spent were in order. Dealing with correspondence, advising or participating in the appointment of staff to schools, and equally important with each other: informal inspection of schools, disseminating the best practices from one school to another, and report writing.

The respondents would prefer to spend less time on two of these activities: dealing with correspondence and report writing, but more time on the other three. If we look at the next seventeen items in order of time spent, we find a mixed pattern of activities. On only one of them, "Attending Education Committee Meetings", did the respondents wish to spend less time.

It is, therefore, tempting to conclude that almost all of these activities were seen by the inspectors as being important. However, if we rank order the activities according to the time the inspectors would wish to spend on them, a much clearer picture emerged. A clear preference for an advisory role which emphasised curriculum development and the spreading of best practices as opposed to formal inspection emerged. (See Tables 6.1, 6.2 and 6.3).

.

TABLE 4.1

	Rating Actual amount of time	Rank Actual amount of time	Rating Preferred Amount of time	Rank Preferred Amount of time
19 Dealing with correspondence	2.5	1st	1.0	21st
2 Advising individual staff about personal or professional problems.	2.2	2nd	2.5	7th
5 Informal Inspection of schools or colleges.	2.0	4th	2.7	2nd
17 Disseminating best practices from one school to another.	2.0	4th	2.9	1st
18 Report writing	2.0	4th	1.2	19th
7 Visiting schools to discuss the problems and needs which they have diagnosed.	1.9	7th	2.6	5th
9 Curriculum Development	1.9	7th	2.7	2nd
12 Attending Inspectors' meeting.	1.9	7th	2.6	5th
8 INSET	1.8	9th	2.0	13th
3 Evaluation and Career Development of individual staff.	1.7	10th	2.6	5th
11 Advising schools on policy changes made by Education Committee.	1.7	11th	2.1	10th
13 Attending Education Committee Meetings.	1.7	11th	1.4	18th
6 Visiting schools to diagnose problems.	1.4	13th	2.3	9th
14 Advising individual head teachers.	1.4	13th	1.9	16th
21 Working contact with teachers' centre staff.	1.3	15th	1.9	16th
15 Observing teachers in their classes.	1.3	16th	2.1	11th
4 Formal inspection of schools or colleges.	1.2	18th	2.0	13th
10 Advising Ed. Committees	1.2	18th	1.8	17th
16 Advising individual teachers	1.2	18th	2.5	7th
20 Advising on the design furnishing equipment of schools	1.2	18th	1.0	21st
1 Advising or participating on the appointment of staff.	1.1	21st	2.0	13th
22 Contact with HMI	1.0	22nd	1.0	21st

TABLE 4.2

		Actual Rating	Time Rank	Preferred Rating	Time Rank
17	Disseminating best practices from one school to another.	2.0	4th	2.9	1st
5	Informal Inspection of schools or colleges.	2.0	4th	2.7	2nd
9	Curriculum Development	1.9	7th	2.7	2nd
7	Visiting schools to discuss their problems and needs which they have diagnosed.	1.9	7th	2.6	5th
12	Attending Inspectors' meetings.	1.9	7th	2.6	5th
3	Evaluation and Career Development of individual staff.	1.7	10th	2.6	5th
2	Advising individual staff about personal or professional matters.	2.2	2nd	2.5	7th
16	Advising individual teachers	1.2	18th	2.5	7th
6	Visiting schools to diagnose their problems and needs.	1.4	13th	2.3	9th
11	Advising schools on policy changes, made by Ed.Comm.	1.7	11th	2.1	10th
15	Observing teachers in their classes.	1.3	16th	2.1	11th
8	INSET	1.8	9th	2.0	13th
4	Formal inspection of schools or colleges.	1.2	18th	2.0	13th
1	Advising or participating in the appointment of staff to schools.	1.1	21st	2.0	13th
21	Working contact with Teachers' centre staff	1.3	15th	1.9	15th
14	Advising individual head teachers.	1.4	15th	1.9	16th
10	Advising Ed.Comm.	1.2	18th	1.8	17th
13	Attending Education Committee Meetings.	1.7	11th	1.4	18th
18	Report Writing	2.0	4th	1.2	19th
19	Dealing with correspondence	2.5	1st	1.0	21st
20	Advising on the design, furnishing and equipment of schools or colleges.	1.2	18th	1.0	21st
22	Contact with HMIs	1.0	22nd	1.0	21st

TABLE 4.3

					Mean Rates	R				Mean Rating	R
		A	B	C		A N K S	A	B	C		A N K S
2	Advising individual staff on personal or professional matters.	3	12	-	2.2	2	8	7	-	2.5	7.5
5	Informal inspection of schools.	-	15	-	2	4	11	4	-	2.7	2.5
17	Disseminating the best practices from one school to another.	1	13	1	2	4	13	2	-	2.8	1
18	Report writing	1	13	1	2	4	1	1	13	1.2	19
19	Dealing with correspondence	9	5	1	2.5	1	-	-	15	1	21

The five out of twenty-two activities with highest mean ratings for the time actually spent will be considered first. The five activities are shown in the Table 4.3. Advising individual staff on personal or professional matters was very important because its mean rating was 2.2 and ranking was 2nd in the actual time, and a mean rating of 2.5 and ranking of fifth in the preferred time.

Informal inspection of schools was also considered to be one of the most important because its mean rating was 2 which produced a ranking of fourth for actual time spent. In the preferred time, its mean rating was 2.7, with a ranking of 2.5.

Disseminating the best practices from one school to another also emerged as being important. Its mean rating was 2 and a ranking of 4th on the actual time, and a mean rating of 2.8 gave it a ranking of first in the preferred time.

Report writing was an important activity as far as time actually spent was concerned. Its mean rating was 2, with a rank of 4th in actual time, and a mean rating of 1.2 and a rank of 19th in the preferred time.

Finally, Dealing with Correspondence was important for its mean rating was 2.5, with a rank of first in the actual time spent. In the preferred time, its mean rating was 1.0, and its ranking was 21st.

The remaining seventeen tasks would now be considered. Activity 1: Staff Appointment had its mean rating of 1.1 and ranking of 21st

in the actual time. These made it unimportant. Activity 3: Evaluation and Career Development of individual staff was unimportant because its mean rating was 1.7, and a rank of tenth in the actual time and a rating of 2.6, and a rank of 5th in the preferred time. Similarly, activities 4, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10 were considered unimportant.

An important finding was that the inspectors wanted to spend more time on almost everything. In Activity 1: Staff Appointments, its mean rating was 1.1, and its ranking was 21st in the actual time spent; its mean rating in the preferred time was 2, and ranking was 13th. They preferred to spend more time on it.

In Activity 2, Advising Individual Staff on Personal or Professional Matters, the mean rating was 2.2, and ranking was 2nd; its preferred mean rating was 2.5, and a ranking of 4th. The inspectors wanted to spend more time on it. In Activity 3, Evaluation and Career Development, its mean rating was 1.7, and a rank of 10th on actual time; its mean rating was 2.6, and a rank of 5th on the preferred time. The inspectors wanted to spend more time on it.

In Activity 2, Advising Individual Staff on Personal or Professional Matters, the mean rating was 2.2, and ranking was 2nd; its preferred mean rating was 2.5, and a ranking of 4th. The inspectors wanted to spend more time on it. In Activity 3, Evaluation and Career Development, its mean rating was 1.7, and a rank of 10th on actual time; its mean rating was 2.6, and a rank of 5th on the preferred time. The inspectors wanted to spend more time on it.

In Activity 4, Formal Inspection of Schools, its mean rating was 1.2, and ranking of 18.5th on actual time; and a mean rating of 2, and a rank of 13th on its preferred time. The inspectors wanted to spend more time on it.

In Activity 5, Informal Inspection of Schools, its mean rating was 2.0, and ranking of 4th on actual time; and mean rating of 2.7 and a rank of 2.5th. The inspectors wanted to spend more time on it.

In Activity 6, Visiting Schools to Diagnose their Problems and Needs, its mean rating was 1.4, and ranking was 13.5th in the actual time, and a mean rating of 2.2, and ranking of 9th in the preferred time. The inspectors wanted to spend more time on it.

In Activity 7, Visiting Schools to Discuss the Problems and Needs which they have diagnosed, its mean rating was 1.8, and ranking of 7th on the actual time; and a mean rating of 2.6, and a rank of 5th on the preferred time. The inspectors wanted to spend more time on it.

In Activity 8, In-Service Training, the mean rating was 1.8, and a rank of 9th on the actual time; and a mean rating of 2, and rank of 13th on its preferred time. The inspectors wanted to spend more time on it.

In Activity 9, Curriculum Developments, its mean rating was 1.8, and a rank of 7th on the actual time, and a mean rating of 2.7, and

a rank of 2.5th on the preferred time. The inspectors wanted to spend more time on it.

Similarly, in Activity 11, Advising Schools on Policy Changes made by the Education Committees; 12: Attending Inspectors' Meetings; 15: Advising Individual Teachers and 17: Disseminating the Best Practices from One School to Another, the inspectors wanted to spend more time on it.

It would be a mistake, however, to think that all the inspectors feel the same way about how their time should be spent, or have the same actual priorities as far as their day to day activities were concerned.

Taking the activities in order, given by the ranks for actual amount of time, we could see whether there was individual variation. To make clear a cross-tabulation has been prepared contrasting the responses for actual and preferred amounts of time.

4.2 Activity 1: Advising or Participating in the Appointment of Staff to Schools

PREFERRED TIME					
		C	B	A	
ACTUAL TIME	C	0	13	0	13
	B	0	2	0	2
	A	0	0	0	
			15	15	
RATING			RANK		
A A T		1.1		21st	
P A T		2.0		13th	

Some inspectors spent some time on staff appointments up to the level of deputy-heads or vice-principals. Senior inspectors were most likely to spend time on staff appointments, and this was most marked in relation to the appointment of senior staff, that is, heads of departments. On the other hand, ordinary level staff were more likely than their senior colleagues to want to spend more time appointing staff other than heads or principals.

Thirteen inspectors were actually spending a little amount of time on staff appointments. On the other hand, all the fifteen inspectors would prefer to spend a fair amount of time on this activity. Its mean rating was 1.1, and rank of 21st on the actual time. Its mean rating was 2, and rank of 13th on the preferred amount of time. In general, inspectors regarded this as an important area of work, and some wished to spend more time on it. This was reflected in some typical comments:

"Head teachers appointments were crucial to the work of schools. The endeavour continually to appoint suitable staff probably constitutes the key aim of this job. Without good teachers to translate high flown ideas into practice, there is little point in contemplating educational innovation."

A number of inspectors commented that they did not have the time to be involved with all staff appointments, and therefore restricted themselves appointing only to senior posts:

"Time does not permit me to interview staff below Scale III."

There were two major areas of criticisms: the inadequacy of the appointing procedures and the poor quality of candidates. As far as the former was concerned, several aspects of the procedures were criticised:

"I am convinced that one interviewer with one professional officer working with a lay committee is an inadequate means of appointing head teachers and principals."

The comments on the quality of candidates tended to be general: "lack of applicants, often no real choice in making appointments or to mention specific teachers shortage: the shortage of craft and technical studies teachers is the biggest difficulty."

4.3 Activity 2: Advising Individual Staff about Personal or Professional Matters

PREFERRED TIME					
		C	B	A	
ACTUAL TIME	C	0	0	0	
	B	0	4	8	12
	A	0	3	0	3
			7	8	15
MEAN RATING					RANK
A A T		2.2			2nd
P A T		2.5			5th

Inspectors were asked to state the amount of time they spent advising individual staff on personal and professional matters, and the amount of time they would prefer to spend on this task. The very term 'adviser' indicates that this is probably a central task, and it was anticipated that many would have strong views as to the amount of time spent on it. This was borne out by such comments as:

"I regard this as the main function of the inspector and regret that administrative responsibility takes up too much of my time."

Twelve inspectors or 80% of the sample were actually spending a fair amount of time on this activity; three inspectors were spending a large amount of time. Seven would prefer to spend a fair amount of time; while eight would prefer to spend a large amount of time on it.

This is an important activity for its mean rating was 2.2, and a ranking of 2nd in the actual time, and a mean rating of 2.5 and ranking of 5th on the preferred time. Thus, the majority of the respondents were involved in advising all types of staff. Some indication of the importance they attach to this task is given by the fact that all of them stated that they would prefer to spend either the same amount of time or more time doing so. Many comments indicated particular concern about probationers:

"New teachers still need an enormous amount of help in classrooms and teaching techniques. Very few seemed to have been given an adequate grounding in administrative and teaching procedures during their training."

Probably, probationers were the most valuable class on which to concentrate. They needed to realise their importance as seminal injection into old tissue. Giving individual advice is time-consuming, since it is necessary to build up a relationship with the teachers before advice could be given. As one respondent commented:

"Regular visits to schools are essential to identify individual strengths and weaknesses and to establish good personal relationships. Pressures of administrative work often makes it difficult to visit as often as one would wish."

4.4 Activity 3: Evaluation and Career Development of Individual Staff

		PREFERRED TIME			
		C	B	A	
ACTUAL TIME	C	1	3	0	4
	B	0	1	10	11
	A	0	0	0	
		1	4	10	
		RATING		RANK	
A A T		1.7		10th	
P A T		2.6		5th	

Inspectors were asked to state the amount of time they spent on evaluation and career development of individual staff, and the amount of time they would prefer to spend on the activity.

It would be seen from the above table that four inspectors were actually spending a small amount of time on it. Eleven inspectors were spending a fair amount of time on it, but no-one was spending a large amount of time on it. Ten inspectors would prefer to spend a large amount of time on it. Four inspectors would prefer to spend a fair amount of time on it, while one would prefer to spend a small amount of time on it.

Its mean rating on the actual time spent was 1.7, and its ranking was 10th. On the preferred time, its rating was 2.6, and its ranking was 5th.

The sensitivity of this aspect of inspector's function was clear, as one respondent commented:

"I do not consider this part of my work and think that anything approaching it would detract from the frank personal relationship which I need with the head and staff of the schools which I visit."

Another respondent commented:

"I am not an inspector. It is, however, necessary to evaluate and assess staff in order to be able to advise them about their work. Even those who were committed to evaluation as a part of their role were unhappy about its practical difficulty."

4.5 Activity 4: Formal Inspection of Schools or Colleges

		PREFERRED TIME			
		C	B	A	
ACTUAL TIME	C	1	11	0	12
	B	0	2	1	3
	A	0	0	0	
		1	13	1	15
		RATING		RANK	
A A T		1.2		18th	
P A T		2.0		13th	

The inspectors were asked to indicate how much time they spent and would prefer to spend on formal inspection of schools or colleges. As seen from the table above, twelve inspectors were actually spending some little amount of time, whereas three inspectors were spending a fair amount of time on it. No-one was spending a large amount of time. On the other hand, thirteen inspectors would prefer to spend a fair amount of time on it. One inspector would prefer to spend a large amount of time, and least amount of time respectively. On the actual time, its mean rating was 1.2, and ranking was 18.5th. On the preferred time, its mean rating was 2.0, and ranking was 13th.

Several inspectors stated that inspections were carried out mainly by senior staff. Others commented that inspection was not an activity which they considered to be part of their role:

"Our role is not so much inspection as advisory."

The comments revealed that a large proportion of advisers did not regard this task as a proper part of their function. Some respondents felt that inspection served a number of important functions. For example, formal inspection was valuable to the inspectors because it allowed a deeper examination of schools and colleges than was otherwise possible. The school or college inspector reacted to the situation with a general tightening up and a rethinking of their role. On the other hand, some pointed out that inspection did have some disadvantages:

"Inspection can destroy the relationship which one has built up over a prolonged period."

Other respondents stated that, although they were not involved in inspection as such, they often do a team exercise in schools and colleges. These comments indicated that inspections have a variety of aims and objectives, and that the term itself is ambiguous. Usual connotations included assessment, evaluation and accountability. Many respondents were using the term as such. However, others emphasised its use as a method of getting to know the work of schools and colleges in detail, as a kind of information collection process:

4.7 Activity 6: Visiting Schools to Diagnose their
 Problems and Needs

		PREFERRED TIME			
		C	B	A	
ACTUAL TIME	C	0	8	1	9
	B	1	1	4	6
	A	0	0	0	
		1	9	5	15
		RATING		RANK	
A A T		1.4		13th	
P A T		2.3		9th	

The respondents were asked to state the amount of time they actually spent, and would prefer to spend on visiting schools or colleges to diagnose their problems and needs. Nine inspectors were actually spending a little amount of time, and six were spending a fair amount of time. None were spending a large amount of time, but nine inspectors would prefer to spend a fair amount of time, and five would prefer to spend a large amount of time on it.

On actual time, its mean rating was 1.4, and a rank of 13th. In the preferred time, its mean rating was 2.3, and a rank of 9th.

Every inspector in the sample had visited at least one school in the week before the interview. When they were asked why they visited schools, how often, for how long and whom they saw on their

visits, several different patterns emerged. In the overall sample, inspectors averaged six visits per week. Approximately half their visits were repeat visits to schools previously visited by the same inspector within one month. Most visits were of 1 to 3 hours duration. Most of the visits were concerned with personal matters, such as advising on classroom teaching.

4.8 Activity 7: Visiting Schools to Discuss the Problems and Needs which they have Diagnosed and to indicate their Solution

PREFERRED TIME					
		C	B	A	
ACTUAL TIME	C	2	1	0	3
	B	0	1	10	11
	A	0	0	1	1
		2	2	11	15
		RATING		RANK	
A A T		1.9		7th	
P A T		2.6		5th	

Three inspectors were spending a small amount of time, while eleven inspectors were actually spending a fair amount of time on it. Only one inspector was actually spending a large amount of time. On the other hand, eleven inspectors would prefer to spend a large amount of time on it. Two inspectors would prefer to spend a fair and small amount of time on it. On the actual amount of time, its mean rating was 1.9, and ranking was 7th. In the preferred amount of time, its mean rating was 2.6, and a rank of 5th.

4.9 Activity 8: In-Service Education and Training of Teachers

		PREFERRED TIME			
		C	B	A	
ACTUAL TIME	C	0	4	0	4
	B	5	1	4	10
	A	0	0	1	1
		5	5	5	15
		RATING		RANK	
A A T		1.8		9th	
P A T		2.0		13th	

The respondents were asked to state the amount of time they actually spent and would prefer to spend on in-service education and training of teachers. Four respondents spent a small amount of time, and only one actually spent a large amount of time on it. Five respondents would prefer to spend a large amount of time, and five a fair amount of time, and five would prefer to spend a small amount of time. This was an important activity. Its mean rating was 1.8, and ranking was 9th on the actual time; its mean rating was 2.0, and ranking was 13th on the preferred time.

A major draw-back of traditional in-service courses is that individual teachers who attend them often find it impossible to implement any new ideas they may have gained. They encounter so many barriers when they return to school that the course is quite often rendered ineffective, as one respondent commented:

"It quite often happens that only one member of staff of a school attends. He returns to the school with good ideas, but sometimes is faced with the task of influencing other members of the staff before he can put his ideas into practice."

4.10 Activity 9: Curriculum Development

		PREFERRED TIME			
		C	B	A	
ACTUAL TIME	C	1	1	0	2
	B	0	1	12	13
	A	0	0	0	
		1	2	12	15
		RATING		RANK	
A A T		1.8		7th	
P A T		2.7		2nd	

Respondents were asked to say how much time they actually spent and would prefer to spend on Curriculum Development. Thirteen inspectors were spending a fair amount of time; two inspectors were spending a small amount of time, and none a large amount of time. On the other hand, twelve inspectors would prefer to spend a fair amount of time, and one a small amount of time.

Its mean rating was 1.8, and ranking of 7th on the actual time; and a mean rating of 2.7, and a rank of 2nd on the preferred time.

Respondents' comments showed that they were involved in a great variety of curriculum projects, ranging from large nationally-based projects of the School Council type, to small home-made projects involving a group of interested teachers working together, with no extra resources or outside support. There were many comments which revealed that one of the basic problems encountered in this type of work was a lack of resources. Under this heading were included: lack of inspector's time, lack of teacher's time, teacher shortage, teacher release problems, lack of equipment, travelling problems and general lack of finance.

4.11 Activity 10: Advising Education Committees on Policy Changes in Schools and Colleges

PREFERRED TIME					
		C	B	A	
ACTUAL	C	3	9	0	12
	B	0	3	0	3
	A	0	0	0	
		3	12	15	
		MEAN RATING		RANK	
A A T		1.2		18th	
P A T		1.8		17th	

Respondents were asked to say how much time they actually spent and would prefer to spend on three tasks:

i) directly reporting to/making recommendations to the education committees, either orally or in writing;

ii) reporting to/making recommendations to a colleague prior to his attendance at the education committee, or its sub-committees;

iii) attending as an observer only meetings of the education committees or its sub-committees.

Twelve inspectors actually spent a small amount of time and three a fair amount of time on the activity. None spent a large amount of time on it. On the other hand, twelve inspectors would prefer to spend a fair amount of time, and three would prefer to spend a little amount of time on it. None would prefer to spend a large amount of time on the activity. Its mean rating was 1.2, and ranking was 18th on the actual time. On the preferred time, its mean rating was 1.8, and ranking of 17th.

It was clear that this task area was seen as particularly importance since it was through contact with the education committees or sub-committees that inspectors were able to influence LEA policy decisions. Some respondents did have direct access to the committees, and some had indirect access via colleagues.

4.12 Activity 11: Advising Schools and Colleges on Policy Changes made by the Education Committees

		PREFERRED TIME			
		C	B	A	
ACTUAL TIME	C	5	0	0	5
	B	1	1	8	10
	A	0	0	0	
		6	1	8	15
		MEAN RATING		RANK	
A A T		1.7		11th	
P A T		2.1		10th	

The respondents were asked to say how much time they actually spent and would prefer to spend on advising schools or colleges on policy changes made by education committees or sub-committees. Five inspectors were actually spending a small amount of time on it, while ten inspectors were spending a fair amount of time, but none a large amount of time. Eight inspectors would prefer to spend a large amount of time; six inspectors would prefer to spend a little amount of time, and one a fair amount of time on it.

This was an important activity for its mean rating was 1.7, with a rank of 11th on the actual time; its mean rating was 2.1, and a rank of 10th on the preferred time.

4.13 Activity 12: Attending School Inspectors' Meetings

		PREFERRED TIME			
		C	B	A	
ACTUAL TIME	C	2	1	0	3
	B	0	1	10	11
	A	0	0	1	1
		2	2	11	15
		MEAN RATING		RANK	
A A T		1.9		7th	
P A T		2.6		5th	

The respondents were asked to say the amount of time which they actually spent, and would prefer to spend on attending school inspectors' meetings.

Three inspectors were actually spending a small amount of time, while eleven inspectors were spending a fair amount of time on it, and one inspector a large amount of time. Eleven inspectors would prefer to spend a large amount of time, and two would prefer to spend a fair amount of time, and two a small amount of time.

Its mean rating was 1.9, with a rank of 7th on the actual time, and the mean rating of 2.6, with a rank of 5th on its preferred time.

4.14 Activity 13: Attending Education Committee Meetings

PREFERRED TIME					
		C	B	A	
ACTUAL TIME	C	2	3	0	5
	B	8	1	1	10
	A	0	0	0	
		10	4	1	15

	MEAN RATING	RANK
A A T	1.7	11th
P A T	1.4	18th

The respondents were asked to indicate how much time they actually spent, and would prefer to spend on attending education committee meetings. Five inspectors were actually spending a small amount of time, while ten inspectors were spending a fair amount of time, but no inspector was actually spending a large amount of time.

On the other hand, ten inspectors would prefer to spend a small amount of time; four, a fair amount of time, and one, a large amount of time on it.

Its mean rating was 1.7, with a rank of 11th on the actual time; its mean rating was 1.4, with a rank of 18th on the preferred time.

Some inspectors stated they briefed colleagues prior to their attendance at the education committee meetings, while others said

they attended the committee meetings as observers. The general impression given by respondents' comments was that they felt this to be an unproductive way of spending their time. Since they were unable to influence events by their attendance.

4.15 Activity 14: Advising Individual Head Teachers

		PREFERRED TIME			
		C	B	A	
ACTUAL TIME	C	1	9	0	10
	B	1	3	0	4
	A	0	1	0	1
		2	13		15

	MEAN RATING	RANK
A A T	1.4	13th
P A T	1.9	6th

The respondents were asked to indicate how much time they actually spent, and would prefer to spend on advising individual head teachers.

Ten inspectors were spending a small amount of time. Four were spending a fair amount of time, and one a large amount of time on the activity. On the other hand, thirteen inspectors would prefer to spend a fair amount of time, and two a small amount of time. None would prefer to spend a large amount of time on it.

On the actual time, its mean rating was 1.4, with a rank of 13th. Its mean rating was 1.9, with a rank of 6th on the preferred time.

4.16 Activity 15: Observing Teachers in their Classes

		PREFERRED TIME			
		C	B	A	
ACTUAL TIME	C	1	11	0	12
	B	0	0	2	2
	A	0	1	0	1
		1	12	2	15
		MEAN RATING		RANK	
A A T		1.3		16th	
P A T		2.1		11th	

The respondents were asked to indicate how much time they actually spent, and would prefer to spend on observing teachers in their classes. Twelve inspectors, or 80% of the sample, were actually spending a small amount of time. Two were spending a fair amount of time, and only one inspector was spending a large amount of time on it.

Twelve inspectors, or 80% of the sample, would prefer to spend a fair amount of time; two would prefer to spend a large amount of time, and one a small amount of time on it. Its actual time rating was 1.3, with a rank of 16th. The preferred time mean rating was 2.1, with a rank of 11th.

4.17 Activity 16: Advising Individual Teachers

PREFERRED TIME					
		C	B	A	
ACTUAL TIME	C	1	4	7	12
	B	0	1	2	3
	A	0	0		
		1	5	9	15
			MEAN RATING	RANK	
A A T			1.2	18th	
P A T			2.5	7th	

The respondents were asked to state how much time they actually spent, and would prefer to spend on advising individual teachers. Twelve were actually spending a small amount of time on it. Three inspectors were actually spending a fair amount of time, and none were spending a larte amount of time on the activity. Nine inspectors would prefer to spend a large amount of time on it; five inspectors would prefer to spend a fair amount of time, and one a small amount of time on it.

Its mean rating was 1.2, and a rank of 18th on actual time; its mean rating was 2.5, with a rank of 7th on its preferred time.

The respondents were asked to indicate how much time they actually spent, and would prefer to spend on dealing with correspondence.

Nine inspectors were actually spending a large amount of time on it. Five inspectors spent a fair amount of time, and one spent a small amount of time on it.

Fifteen inspectors would prefer to spend a small amount of time on it. None would prefer to spend a fair amount of time, or a small amount of time on it.

Its mean rating was 2.5, with a rank of first on actual time. Its mean rating was 1.0, with a rank of 21st on its preferred time.

Inspectors' comments showed that they considered their clerical load to be unduly heavy, and that, in consequence, they were unable to spend as much time in schools and colleges as they would have liked:

"I feel I do too much correspondence work, which could often be done by others, providing that a reasonable clerical back-up was available."

Others pointed out that they felt that the priorities were not established by them personally, but by circumstances.

"An impossible question, I exist from crisis to crisis, and make snap judgements about which crisis is more pressing."

4.21 Activity 20: Advising on Furnishing and Design of Schools or Colleges

PREFERRED TIME					
		C	B	A	
ACTUAL TIME	C	13	0	0	13
	B	1	0	0	1
	A	1	0	0	1
		15			15

		MEAN RATING	RANK
A A T		1.2	18th
P A T		1.0	21st

Thirteen inspectors were spending a small amount of time on it. One inspector actually spent a large amount of time, and one spent a fair amount of time on it. Fifteen inspectors would prefer to spend a small amount of time, and none would prefer to spend either a large amount of time, or a fair amount of time on it.

Its mean rating was 1.2, with a rank of 18th on actual time; its mean rating was 1.0, with a rank of 21st on preferred time.

The design, furnishing and equipment of school or college buildings are tasks which involve many different agencies. Apart from the Education Department which approves the plans and provides the money, planners, surveyors, architects, builders and suppliers are also involved. It is necessary that somebody should liaise between all

The respondents were asked to indicate how much time they actually spent and would prefer to spend on working with teachers' centre staff. Twelve inspectors actually spent a small amount of time on it; two inspectors actually spent a large amount of time, and one inspector spent a fair amount of time on the activity. Ten inspectors would prefer to spend a fair amount of time, and two inspectors would prefer to spend a large amount of time on it, while three would prefer to spend a small amount of time on it. Its mean rating was 1.3, with a rank of 15th on actual time; its mean rating was 1.9, with a rank of 15th on preferred time.

4.23 Activity 22: Contact with Her Majesty's Inspectors

		PREFERRED TIME			
		C	B	A	
ACTUAL TIME	C	15	0	0	15
	B	0	0	0	
	A	0	0	0	
		15			15

	MEAN RATING	RANK
A A T	1.0	22nd
P A T	1.0	21st

The respondents were asked to indicate how much time they actually spent and would prefer to spend on contact with HMIs.

Fifteen inspectors actually spent a small amount of time on it; none spent either a fair or a large amount of time on it. Fifteen inspectors would prefer to spend a small amount of time on it; none would prefer to spend neither a large nor a fair amount of time on it.

Its mean rating was 1.0, with a rank of 22nd on actual time; its mean rating was 1.0, with a rank of 21st on preferred time.

4.24 Order of Importance

The five most important activities were:)2! Advising individual staff on personal or professional matters; (5) Informal Inspection of Schools, (17) Disseminating the Best Practices from one school or college to another; (18) Report Writing and (19) Dealing with Correspondence.

2 Advising individual staff on personal or professional matters was very importance because its mean rating was 2.2, and ranking was 2nd on the actual time, and a mean rating of 2.5, and ranking of 5th in the preferred time.

5 Informal inspection of schools or colleges was also considered to be one of the most importance, because its mean rating was 2.0 which produced a ranking of fourth for actual time spent. In the preferred time, its mean rating was 2.7, with a ranking of 2nd.

17 Disseminating the Best Practices from one school to another also emerged as being important. Its mean rating was 2.0, with a ranking of fourth on the actual time, and a mean rating of 2.8 gave it a ranking of the first in the preferred time.

18 Report Writing was an important activity as far as time actually spent was concerned. Its mean rating was 2.0, with a rank of fourth on actual time, and a mean rating of 1.2, and a rank of 19th in the preferred time.

19 Dealing with Correspondence is important for its mean rating was 2.5, with a rank of the first in the actual time. In the preferred time, its mean rating was 1.0, and its ranking was 21st.

4.25 Overall Priorities

One of the most interesting features of the inspectors' role is the degree of flexibility which it allows individuals. In many cases, it is up to the individual inspector to establish his or her own priorities and to decide the way in which he or she can best utilise his or her own expertise. The inspectors were asked to indicate their order of priority for the various aspects of their work. Many inspectors commented that it was a difficult question to answer because some of the activities were cyclical in nature. A good example of these was Staff Appointment: the bulk of appointments are made in the months of May to July each year, and relatively few are made at other times. Thus, during May to July, an inspector's first priority may be staff appointments, whereas for the rest of the year, they do not figure at all in the work load.

"This is very difficult to answer - almost impossible because priorities change. When we do an inspection of a school, this has first priority at this time when we are visiting schools, but the writing of the report has to give priority to other things."

Other respondents felt that, although they could probably estimate their priorities as far as their work was concerned, they could not do so in terms of the list of topics given:

"It is very difficult to arrive at a rank order. Each variable would seem independent. Promote and dissemination of educational philosophy - practices and principles - is top priority, whether this be done by school visits or through advice to policy makers or through in-service training."

It may be concluded that the respondents were reasonably satisfied with the way they were actually able to implement their role with respect to their three principal priorities. It is necessary to look at the research findings which gave high priority to six groups of tasks.

4.26 Research Findings in Rank Order

The research findings gave high priority to six groups of tasks, as shown below:

1st

- 17 Dissemination of Best Practices from One School or College to another.
- 5 Informal Inspection of School.
- 9 Curriculum Development.
- 7 Visiting Schools or Colleges to diagnose their problems and needs.
- 12 Attending Inspectors' Meetings.
- 2 Advising individual staff about personal or professional matters.

3 Evaluation and Career Development of individual staff.

2nd

1 Advising or participating on the Appointment of Staff.

4 Formal inspection of school.

6 Visiting schools to diagnose problems.

10 Advising Education Committees.

14 Advising head teachers.

15 Observing teachers in their classes.

16 Advising individual teachers.

21 Working contact with teachers' centre.

3rd

8 In-service Education of teachers.

11 Advising schools on policy changes made by Education Committees.

4th

18 Report Writing.

19 Dealing with Correspondence.

5th

13 Attending Education Committee meetings.

6th

20 Advising on the design, furnishing and equipment of schools.

22 Contact with HMIs.

The next chapter is the Summary and Conclusions arising from the case study of Middleham, followed by a final comment on the observed operation of HMIs there in the light of the historical and international perspectives provided in Parts A and B.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

5.1 Summary of Findings from the Middleham Study

The five out of twenty-two activities with highest mean ratings for the time actually spent were: (2) Advising individual staff on personal or professional matters; (5) Informal inspection of schools; (17) Disseminating the best practices from one school to another; (18) Report Writing and (19) Dealing with Correspondence.

Advising individual staff on personal and professional matters was very important, because its mean rating was 2.2 and ranking was 2nd on the actual time, and a mean rating of 2.5 and ranking of 5th in the preferred time. Thus, the majority of inspectors were involved in advising all types of staff. Many comments indicated particular concern about lack of time.

"I regard this as the main function of the inspector and regret that administrative responsibility takes up too much of my time."

Informal inspection of schools or colleges was also considered to be one of the most important, because its mean rating was 2.0 which produced a rating of 4th on the actual time spent. In the preferred time, its mean rating was 2.7, with a ranking of second.

Disseminating the Best Practices from one School or College to another emerged as being important. Its mean rating was 2, with a ranking of 4th on the actual time, and a mean rating of 2.8 which gave it a ranking of the first in the preferred time. Report Writing was as important as far as time actually spent was concerned. Its mean rating was 2.0, with a rank of 4th on actual time, and a mean rating of 1.2, and a rank of 19th in the preferred time.

Dealing with Correspondence was important for its mean rating was 2.5, with a rank of first on the actual time; its mean rating was 1.0, and its ranking was 21st.

An important finding was that inspectors wanted to spend more time on almost everything. In Activity 1: Staff Appointment, its mean rating was 1.1, and its ranking was 21st on the actual time spent; its mean rating in the preferred time was 2, and ranking was 13th. The inspectors wanted to spend more time on it.

In Activity 3: Evaluation and Career Development, its mean rating was 1.7, with a rank of 10th on actual time; its mean rating was 2.6, and a rank of 5th on the preferred time. The inspectors wanted to spend more time on it.

In Activity 6: Visiting Schools to Diagnose their Problems and Needs, its mean rating was 1.4, and ranking was 13th on the actual time, and a mean rating of 2.2 and ranking of 9th in the preferred time. The inspectors wanted to spend more time on it. Similarly in Activities 11, 12, 15, and 17, the inspectors wanted to spend more time on them.

Research findings gave high priority to the following activities:

17 Disseminating the Best Practices from one School or College to another.

5 Informal inspection of school.

9 Curriculum Development.

7 Visiting schools to diagnose their problems.

12 Attending inspectors' meetings.

2 Advising individual staff.

3 Evaluation and Career Development.

a) Inspectors as Innovators

The evidence of the earlier chapters confirmed that a great deal of inspectors' time was taken up with improvement and innovation. A major part of the project rationale was based upon this assumption, for it has long been clear that innovation is a significant feature of inspectors' work and although opinions may differ as to its inherent importance in the overall inspectorial role, the way in which it is performed and perceived is an important area of concern and study. Both the observations and the interviews, therefore, explored the innovation role of inspectors.

b) The Observation Data

The questionnaire asked inspectors to indicate the extent to which they functioned in practice, and would prefer to function, as a facilitator of educational innovations. More generally, this question's attempt at the definition of an inspector's main function stimulated a great deal of comments from the inspectors. However, none of the inspectors stated that they totally disagreed with the definition. This is borne out by the tabular data in Tables 1 and 2, which showed that the vast majority both actually did function in this way and would prefer to function to an even greater extent in this way. One inspector commented:

"I think 'facilitators' is a good word because I don't always see myself as the initiator of development, but as able to see and encourage new ideas."

However, although no-one positively disagreed with this definition, few of the inspectors were entirely happy with it and most comments were suggesting modifications or additions to the definition.

One of the points most commonly made was that inspectors had not only a responsibility to innovate but also to guard against undesirable innovation and to allow time for consolidation of innovations:

"The questions pre-suppose educational innovation to be a good thing. But the inspectors role is, in my view, to conserve as well as innovate. As to innovation, the inspector should evaluate as well as facilitate."

Innovation should be a specialist function. People should innovate in what they are most knowledgeable about, most experienced in. The definition suggests that the inspector is concerned only with innovation, that is, the introduction of new ideas or changing old ones. This role does not necessarily apply."

Another area of comment was the degree to which inspectors felt the demands of other aspects of their job inhibited them from acting as a facilitator of innovations:

"The inspector should be well placed for facilitating educational innovation. In practice, the amount of office work and the sorting out of the problems of individual schools, places the emphasis of his work elsewhere."

Despite the problems and reservations expressed by inspectors about their role in relation to innovations, both the data and the comments do show that the vast majority feel this to be an important aspect of their work, if not an entirely comprehensive definition of their role.

c) The Interview Data

This section draws upon two parts of the interview data. Each of these is first presented separately in summary form in Tables 1 and 2. They are then discussed together in greater detail.

During the interviews, inspectors were asked to consider twenty-two statements which most accurately described their role in bringing about change in schools and colleges. The results which are listed

in tables 1 and 2 can be related to six of the knowledge linkage roles identified by Havelock, 1969: ¹

Conveyor - to transfer knowledge from producers to users and between users.

Consultant - to assist users in the identification of problems and resources.

Trainer - to transfer by instilling in the user an understanding of an area of knowledge or practice.

Leader - to effect linkage through power or influence in one's own group; to transfer by example or direction.

Innovator - to transfer by initiating diffusion in the user's system;

Defender - to sensitise the user to the pitfalls of innovation.

With these distinctions in view, linkage roles can be suggested corresponding to each of the activities in table . To the six knowledge-linkage roles, three more different linkage roles may be added in the case of school inspector.

Conveyor
(resources)

- to co-ordinate the implementation in a subordinate system of measures agreed by a higher policy-making body.

Conveyor
(resources)

- to arrange for the transfer of material resources (equipment and finance) between one system and its sub-systems.

Conveyor
(staff)

- to assist in the selection or allocation of staff by acting as an adviser or inspector to the governing body of the school.

d) How the Inspectors brought about changes to Schools and Colleges

- i) (17) Disseminating the Best Practices from one School to Another by Arranging for Direct Contact and Visits between their Staffs; (Conveyor)

This conveyor role was seen as relevant and important by nearly all respondents. Inspectors with area responsibilities were more likely to include this strategy among the five most accurate descriptions of their role in innovation. Referring to the dissemination of innovations from one school to another, one inspector noted that this was done in a rather haphazard way. The strategy was used in a more systematic fashion for facilitating educational innovation in two kinds of situation. Where changes in school design were being considered, inspectors sometimes arranged for teachers to visit other schools and see a proposed new layout already in use, as for example, in open-plan schools.

Where an innovation concerned teaching methods or curriculum and did not involve building design, a school or teachers' centre might serve as a venue for teachers from a group of schools. The LEA inspector has a key role as a linkage agent in this kind of development, bringing together staff from different schools and the resources of the authority. The development and dissemination of innovation through such work groups is an effective way of combining the financial and manpower resources of the LEA, its teachers and inspectors.

ii) (10) Advising the Education Committee on Policy Changes in School. (Conveyor/Leader).

This strategy was identified by some respondents as relevant to their role in bringing about change in schools and colleges. Although inspectors might not meet the education committee directly, their advice communicated through LEA administrators, influenced committee decisions, which resulted in changes within the schools. This view was held by several inspectors, including one who stated:

"The person to advise the education committee is the Director and would not think it any inspector's role to do that. He, the Director, will do that on the advice he receives from an appropriate team."

This view would not exclude a specialist inspector or one responsible for a particular study being made at the request of the committee, from being called in person to advise the committee specifically on his area. Other inspectors did, however, go further than this and emphasise the value of their direct contact with the education

committee in informing committee members of trends in thinking within the education profession. Where the Chief Inspector did not have the opportunity to perform this function in the normal meeting of the education committee, it appeared he might do so through attendance at special meetings as for the appointments of heads. For some respondents, advising the education committee on policy changes, ranked as one of the most accurate descriptions of their role in bringing about change in schools and colleges.

- iii) (6) Visiting Schools/Colleges to Diagnose their Problems and Needs and Indicate Solutions.
(Conveyor/Innovator)
- iv) (7) Visiting Schools/Colleges to Discuss the Problems and Needs which they have Diagnosed.
(Conveyor/Innovator)

These two strategies were identified by nearly all the respondents as relevant to their role in bringing about change in schools/colleges. Both strategies were included in the first and second groups of priorities, respectively.

Comparisons between inspectorial groups regarding their choice between Strategies 6 and 7 suggests that subject specialists are more likely than other groups to see their role as change agent in school visiting, diagnosing problems and indicating their solutions. It would be interesting to compare this with the perception of teachers as to the roles adapted by different inspectors from their standpoint. In Strategy 6, nine inspectors were actually spending a little amount of time, and six were spending a fair amount of time on it. But nine inspectors would prefer to spend a fair amount of time, and five

would prefer to spend a large amount of time on it. On the other hand, in Strategy 7, eleven inspectors were actually spending a fair amount of time on it, but eleven inspectors would prefer to spend a large amount of time on it.

5.2 Discussion and Conclusion: A Comparison of the Historical and Contemporary View of the Role of the Local Authority Inspector

a) Inspection versus Administration

When the School Boards were set up after the 1870 Education Act, they established school management committees to supervise the running of schools. At a meeting of the School Management Committee in May 1872, of the London School Board, it was proposed that in future no managers should be appointed to new schools but that the schools should be managed by inspectors. These were large claims for any inspectorates and had they been adopted, would have modified subsequent development of clerks or secretaries or directors. Later, the School Management Committee said "that it is not desirable that the Board should manage their schools by inspectors; but they think it desirable to have several schools under the same managers."

Edmunds stated that no better case could be made out than the findings for local inspectors should be acting as liaison officers, but not in place of managers.

The LEA inspectors were liaison agents not managers, for they did not pay the teachers salaries. However, some of the aspects of the inspectors' role are closer to administration than other aspects.

Of the more administrative/managerial functions of the LEA inspector studies, only Activity 2, Advising Individual Staff about Personal or Professional Problems is important. Clearly, the early decision that inspectors should not be administrators still holds today.

As to liaison versus administration, the LEA inspectors were involved in liaison in Activities 8, Inset and 17, Dissemination of the Best Practices from one school to another. As to in-service training, the inspectors had liaison activities with teachers. When the Dissemination of the Best Practices is concerned with school design, the inspectors act as linkage agents between different groups.

b) Appointment of LEA Inspectors and Advisers

In their evidence to the Select Committee on HM Inspectorate, the National Association of Inspectors and Education Advisers put the position thus:-

"The work of inspectors of schools of all kinds is educational rather than administrative, and is very closely concerned with the quality and standards of educational provision in schools. Most local authorities, however, appear to regard the appointment of inspectors and advisers unlike that of head teachers and teachers as administrative rather than educational, that although the decision to employ school inspectors rest with the Education Committee of the Council whose members are acquainted with the needs of the service and the schools; that this decision may not be supported by Finance and Establishment Committee, with the result the number of educational inspectors and advisers employed is, in practice, regulated by the deployment of financial resources

rather than by educational needs or concern for the quality and standard of educational provision. That there may be refusal to employ more than the minimum number of such inspectors and advisers."

c) Lack of Suitable Officers

As the duties to be undertaken in the inspectorial field increase, the lack of suitable officers in some areas must lead to a deterioration in the very service provided, whereas in those areas that are understaffed, individual inspectors find themselves carrying such a wide range of unco-ordinated duties that the attention they can give to them tends to become hurried and more superficial than is desirable.

d) Variation between Authorities

The variation in practice as between one authority and another is reflected in the lack of comparability between the criteria of appointment, the duties undertaken and the salary scales paid to inspectors under different local authorities.

e) Assessment of the Role of Inspectors and Advisers

Whatever the inspectorate thinks or says, it can only advise. It has no power to compel and must rely upon persuasion. Her Majesty's Inspectors are by design moved at fairly frequent intervals from one part of the country to another, so that they can see many teachers at work in different situations. The suggestions that they make are based on this varied knowledge. The local authority inspector who usually stays in one place for a much longer period gains a more

intimate knowledge of head teachers and teachers, pupils and parents, than HMIs are able to do, and may therefore be able to employ his or her persuasive powers with greater impact. He is able to foster new developments in schools stage by stage, and is in a position to ensure the provision of the appropriate in-service training of teachers and the provision of necessary equipment.

The present system on which the local inspectorate operates is reasonably effective in authorities with a sufficiently large school population and sufficient enlightenment and financial resources to employ a full complement of local inspectors and advisers. Areas with sparser population and fewer resources, or very small authorities are less well serviced since very few advisory officers are employed.

Arising from both Historical and Empirical Studies: The activities which are common to Historical and Empirical Studies were Activities 1, 2, 11, 14 and 20. Advising or participating on the appointment of Staff was not important because its mean rating was 1.1, and ranking was 21st on the actual time, and a mean rating of 2.0, and ranking of 13th on the preferred time.

Advising Individual Staff about Personal and Professional Problems was important because its mean rating was 2.2, and ranking was 2nd on the actual time, and a mean rating of 2.5, and ranking of 5th on the preferred time.

Activity 11: Advising Schools on Policy Changes made by the Education Committee: This was of only moderate importance for its

mean rating was 1.7, with a rank of 11th on actual time; its mean rating was 2.1, and a rank of 10th on the preferred time.

Activity 14: Advising Individual Head Teachers was Common to Historical and Empirical Studies: This was not an important activity. On actual time, its mean rating was 1.4, with a rank of 13th. Its mean rating was 1.9, with a rank of 16th on the preferred time.

Activity 20: Advising on Furnishing and Design of Schools: This activity, although it was common to both Empirical and Historical Studies, was not important because its mean rating was 1.2, with a rank of 18th on the actual time. Its mean rating was 1.0, with a rank of 21st on the preferred time.

f) Inspection versus Examination

Individual examination gives an accurate assessment of what children have learnt. It also assesses directly the teachers own efficiency. This is Edmund's conclusion. What Edmund's and London School Board Inspectors were saying was that the only accurate measure of efficiency was the number of passes a teacher got for his class on examination day. Even with such a measure, the hands that use it may vary enormously.

This has been one of the teachers' complaints against school inspection. The Scaled Degree: Excellent, Good and Fair, had tended to change unexpectedly with consequent protests from School Board and teachers. Edge was given to the complaint because inspectors'

opinions could still increase or decrease salaries of teachers.

g) Historical and Empirical Studies

There were three activities which were related to both Historical and Empirical Studies. These were: Activity 4: Formal Inspection of Schools; Activity 5: Informal Inspection of Schools, and Activity 15: Observing Teachers in their Classes. Activity 4 was not important because its mean rating was 1.2, and ranking was 18th on the actual time. Its mean rating was 2.0, and ranking was 13th on the preferred time.

Several inspectors stated that formal inspections were carried out mainly by senior staff. Other advisers commented that inspection was not an activity which they considered to be within their role. The comments revealed that some advisers did not regard this task as a proper part of their function.

Another activity which is common and related to Historical and Empirical Studies is Activity 5: Informal Inspection of Schools. Fifteen inspectors, or 100% of the sample, were spending a fair amount of time on it. On the other hand, eleven inspectors would prefer to spend a large amount of time on it. This was an important activity; its mean rating on the actual time was 2.0, and ranking was 4th. On the preferred time, its mean rating was 2.7, and ranking was 2nd.

h) Inspectors as Innovators

The evidence of earlier chapters confirmed that a great deal of inspectors' time was taken up with innovation and improvement. A major part of the project rationale was based upon this assumption, for it has long been clear that innovation is a significant future of inspectors' work. Edmund's confirmed that the inspectors' role is related to innovation. Both the observation and interviews explored the innovative role of the inspectors.

i) Observation Data

The questionnaire asked inspectors to indicate the extent they functioned in practice, and would prefer to function as facilitators of educational innovators. This definition of an inspector's main function stimulated a great deal of comments from the inspectors. One inspector commented:

"I think facilitators is a good word because I don't always see myself as the initiator of development, but as able to see and encourage new ideas."

One of the points most commonly made was that inspectors had not only a responsibility to innovate, but also to guard against undesirable innovation, and to allow time for consideration of innovations:

"The inspector's role is, in my view, to conserve as well as innovate. As to innovation, the inspector should evaluate as well as facilitate. Innovation should be a specialist function. People should innovate in what they are most knowledgeable

about, most experienced in. The definition suggests that the inspector is concerned with innovation; that is, the introduction of new ideas or the changing of old ones."

Another area of comment was the degree to which inspectors felt the demands of other aspects of their job inhibited them from acting as facilitators of innovation:

"The inspectors should be well placed for facilitating educational innovation. In practice, the amount of office work and the sorting out of the problems of individual schools, places the emphasis of his work elsewhere."

Despite the problems and reservations expressed by inspectors about their role in relation to innovation, both the data and the comments do show that the vast majority feel this to be an important aspect of their work, if not an entire definition of their role.

j) Interview Data

During the interviews, inspectors were asked to consider twenty-two statements which most accurately described their role in bringing about change in schools. The results which are listed in Tables 1 and 2, can be related to six of the knowledge linkage roles identified by Havelock in 1969.

- Conveyor - to transfer knowledge from producer to users.
- Consultant - to assist the users in the identification of problems and resources.
- Trainer - to transfer by instilling in the user an understanding of an area of knowledge or practice.
- Leader - to effect linkage through power or influence in one's group, to transfer by example or direction.
- Innovator - to transfer by initiating diffusion in the user's system.
- Defender - to sensitise the user to the pitfalls of innovation.

Three more linkage roles may be added in the case of school inspectors and advisers:

Conveyor
(resources)

- to co-ordinate the implementation in a subordinate system of measures agreed by a higher policy-making body.

Conveyor
(resources)

- to arrange for the transfer of material resources (equipment and finance) between one system and its sub-systems.

Conveyor
(staff)

- to assist in the selection or allocation of staff by acting as an adviser or inspector to the governing bodies of the schools.

How the inspectors brought about changes to schools and colleges:

Activity 17: Disseminating the Best Practices from one School
to Another

by arranging for direct contact and visits between the staffs (conveyor).

The conveyor's role was seen as relevant and important by nearly all the respondents. Inspectors with area responsibility were more likely to include this strategy among the five most accurate descriptions of their role in innovation. Referring to the dissemination of innovation from one school to another, one inspector noted that this was done in a rather haphazard way. The strategy was used in a more systematic fashion for facilitating educational innovation in two kinds of situation: Where changes in school design were being considered, inspectors sometimes arrange for teachers to visit other schools and see a proposed new layout already in use, e.g. open-plan schools.

Where innovation concerned teaching method, a school or teachers' centre might serve as a venue for teachers from a group of schools. The LEA inspector has a key role as a linkage agent in this kind of development, bringing together staff from different schools and the resources of the authority. The development and dissemination of innovation through such work groups is an effective way of combining manpower resources of the LEA, its teachers and inspectors.

5.3 Conclusions and Recommendations

This project has set out with the aims of analysing and describing the innovative role of LEA inspectors in relation to their broader role and to explore the implications for the training of inspectors. The purpose of this final section of the report is to relate the project's findings to these aims.

a) The Roles of Inspectors

It is evident that there are a number of difficulties associated with the role of inspectors as facilitators of innovation. These appear to stem from two sources. First, they are sometimes referred to as 'janus' figures because they are required to face in two directions simultaneously - towards the teachers and schools, and towards the policy-makers and administrators. This can mean that both teachers and administrators regard inspectors as marginal figures who offer idealistic solutions to problems which are not their central concern.

Second, their role may be analysed along two dimensions - an administrative dimension and a professional dimension. In their administrative or inspectorial role, they inform teachers and schools about decisions taken by policy-makers and administrators, and evaluate their performances. In their professional or advisory role, they try to improve educational standards through their advice to teachers and schools. They also advise policy-makers and administrators about the needs and problems of schools and teachers.

b) Advise or Inspect?

The climate of professional opinion on the question of inspection and advice is not quite clear. But successive cutbacks in public expenditure following the oil and economic crisis in unemployment have led to strong political demand for cost-effectiveness and accountability. The result of this development has been a much greater demand and concern for the LEAs to use their inspectors to inspect schools and teachers. One can only speculate on the actual response of inspectors and teachers to these changes, but Tables 6.2, 6.3, 6.4 and 6.8 certainly give some clear indications. These tables consist of the data arising from the responses to four relevant questionnaire items: two of them deal with what are essentially advisory tasks, and the other two deal with inspectorial tasks. The two advisory tasks are: (2) Advising Individual Staff on Personal and Professional Matters, (8) In-Service Training. The two inspectorial tasks are: (3) Evaluation of Individual Staff, and (4) Inspection of Schools.

The contrast is very striking: 80 per cent and 67 per cent said they actually spent a fair amount of time on, respectively, Advising Individual Staff and In-Service Training; whereas 73 per cent and 20 per cent said so for Evaluation of Teachers and School Inspections, respectively. The contrast is even sharper when these figures are set alongside those for what the respondents would prefer more time on: 53 per cent and 33 per cent said they would prefer to spend a large amount of time on the two advisory tasks respectively; whereas 67 per cent and 6 per cent respectively, said so for the two inspectorial tasks.

On the basis of this evidence, it seems reasonable to conclude that many of the inspectors are likely to react unfavourably to demands that they should extend their inspectorial role.

This conclusion also finds support in the reasons given by many respondents for joining the inspectorial service. These were largely to do with a desire to improve the system through the advisory role. It is also likely that teachers' professional organisations will oppose moves of this kind, not least because some of them are committed to the concept of professionalism which includes the right of the profession to monitor and supervise its own standards.

c) Contextual Development

There are at least four developments which seem likely to affect the way the role of LEA inspectors are seen by themselves and others in the near future.

- a) First, the public expenditure cuts have led some politicians to advocate cuts in the number of LEA inspectors;
- b) Second, there is much more public demand for cost-effectiveness in schools;
- c) Third, there is much more public concern about standards in schools;

d) A fourth significant development is the substantial growth in the number of staff carrying out jobs closely similar to those of LEA inspectors, notably teachers' centre wardens, and advisory teachers.

All four developments seem likely to push the inspectorial service in the same direction: towards an evaluative, administrative and organisational role, and away from advising individual teachers and direct participation in in-service training. Yet, the project data suggests that a substantial proportion of LEA inspectors derive their main job satisfaction from contact with teachers in the advisory part of their role, and are happy to be dropping general inspections in the administrative part of their role. If this is the case, then the changes discussed above may well diminish the group's job satisfaction quite considerably. That is to say, that part of the job which they most enjoy - the advisory role - may be carried out in future by advisory teachers, and teachers' centre-wardens. These developments may contribute significantly to an increase in differentiation and stratification within the profession. Over the past generation, LEA inspectors have taken over many of the jobs previously undertaken by HMIs and in consequence, the latter have recently gone through a period in which they have had to redefine their role. A similar process now appears to be taking place with respect to LEA inspectors. Over the next few years they, too, may find themselves having to redefine their role as they are required to carry out new tasks as new groups carry out their old tasks.

d) School Survey

By school survey is meant the inspection, not of individual schools, but of all the schools serving an area. Such inspection of schools might well be undertaken by a team of experts involving both Her Majesty's Inspectors and LEA Inspectors. An example of such a survey is HM Inspectors' Survey of Mixed Ability in Primary Schools in 1978.² Thus, inspection of a single school is not as valuable as a broad survey of school requirements in a whole neighbourhood. Such a survey may not only reveal a scale of needs for schoolteachers, but may indicate to the LEAs how their strengths could be deployed to the best immediate advantage. Such survey on an area basis with emphasis upon children's progress would also be of great advantage to the schools themselves.

Given the existing educational framework, it is not always easy for infant, junior and secondary schools and further education institutions to keep in close contact with each other. The system is not as co-ordinated as it should be. School surveys could strengthen the links it has with secondary schools. A survey of all the schools in an area could well serve to draw attention to the need for and the nature of such links, e.g. in curriculum planning.

Particular attention may be drawn to those schools doing any new project successfully. There seems to be no reason why good schools generally should not only reveal socio-educational problems in an area and indicate solution; it will also provide opportunities for teachers and inspectors to work together with members of the local community.

In America, exciting work along these lines has already been undertaken under the title of community projects.

e) Changing Roles

School inspection is not like it used to be. The roles and responsibilities of inspectors and advisors are less clear today than in the nineteenth century. The expectations held for inspectors and advisers are changing in the same way as are their schools' attempt to respond to the demands and pressures upon them by society and increasing professional staff of teachers.

f) Today's Pressures

Today's inspector or adviser is spending less and less time with individual teachers. Not only has the number of teachers frequently increased so drastically now, compared to what it was in the nineteenth century, as to make this impractical, but also in many cases, teachers' knowledge and skill in a particular curriculum area or teaching strategy has surpassed those of some inspectors or advisers whose training and experience have been directed elsewhere.

Team teaching is an example. Few of today's inspectors were exposed to the concept of team teaching in their preparatory programmes. So how does an inspector provide assistance to teachers so engaged? It can be argued that inspectors whose preparation programmes did not cover team teaching or similar subjects are later exposed to them through in-service education. However, it is true to state that the traditional role for inspectors is becoming increasingly less functionable in many schools.

A second phenomenon affecting the role and functions of some inspectors and advisers relates to the increased emphasis on innovation. Much of the leadership responsibility for innovative programmes now seemed to be assigned to and accepted by head teachers who are to develop such programmes within their own schools. Recent events, however, have caused many head teachers to recognise and value leadership opportunities available through developing unique innovative programmes.

A third factor affecting today's inspector is the growth of LEA advisers. Both HMI and LEA inspectors perform almost the same function. Here there appears to be no attempt to clarify each others roles and responsibilities.

A fourth factor which is affecting the role and functions of inspectors is the growth of the Schools Council for Curriculum Development and Examination. The changes cited illustrate that old roles are increasingly inadequate.

For many years, one of the main aims of inspection has been the improvement of instruction. Now the question is increasingly shifted from the improvement of instruction to how to influence the direction of educational change. To this point, several new roles appear not only possible, feasible and practical, but also expeditious for inspectors and advisers. Among these possible new roles are those discussed below.

g) New Roles for Inspectors and Advisers

It would seem that the inspector or adviser might well become the person responsible for long range instructional planning becomes a necessity. Who is better equipped than the inspector or adviser to undertake this task? This change in role will require new knowledge and skills. It would be desirable for the inspector or adviser to seek this responsibility, and to acquire the requisite knowledge and skills as instructional planners.

It would also seem that inspectors and advisers could play some significant roles in monitoring planned changes in programmes. Again, in response to demands for increased accountability, and as an integral part of planned change, the school organisation should assign the responsibility for monitoring the change. Inspectors and advisers could well seek this role and acquire requisite knowledge and skills for its execution, and thus influence instructional change from a management position.

A third avenue for the inspector and adviser is that of becoming programme evaluators. Closely allied with planning, evaluation will become increasingly significant in instructional improvement.

A fourth area illustrating new roles and new opportunities for inspectors and advisers is that of experimentation. As schools respond to pressures, many will find it advantageous to test planning changes. Here the school inspector has an opportunity to function, not only as a planner, monitor or evaluator, but also as a director of research and experimentation itself.

The fifth new role is of in-service teacher educator. Summarising, as schools respond to increasing pressures, inspection is changing. Schools are becoming more formal and organisations are resorting to more management systems. Inspectors and advisers will need to become more closely identified with management positions as planners, monitors, evaluators, experimenters and teacher educators. Such radical departures from the roles previously played by many inspectors and advisers will require considerable modification in perspectives, in knowledge and in skills. Yet, since inspectors' aim is the improvement of instruction, present conditions require such changes. School inspection is not what it used to be. What it will become in the future is anyone's guess. Yet one thing is certain, it will become that which inspectors do in terms of roles they seek and the services they render in their school organisations as these respond to parents' demands.

The inspector's role will change. It seems that such changes will be more productive if they are initiated by inspectors and advisers themselves through in-service training of teachers and staff developments.

h) Middleham in Perspective

The empirical section of this study has been concerned with the typical role of the school inspector in England at the present time. But there are many changes occurring within education and within society as a whole which are beginning to lead to a re-definition of

the role, and one would expect that the picture presented here would become out of date within the next few years.

Schools are beginning to change radically in their internal structure. In particular, many schools are experimenting with teaching units varying greatly in size and introducing team teaching. Some of the newer schools are being designed with such flexibility in mind. Thus, the notion of the single inspector working with a single school may soon be completely outmoded. In future, school inspection has to be informal and more on a sampling basis.

Surveys of particular aspects of education over a number of schools are often found to be of more value than formal inspection of a single establishment, according to: Select Committee on Education and Science, (1968), Report: Part 1. Her Majesty's Inspectorate, (England and Wales), London: HMSO. Such a change would demand a greater co-operation between inspectors and teachers. It has been suggested that in order to make a real impact upon schools, inspectors may need to be trained not as individuals but as cadres to go into schools as a team.

New techniques of instruction such as closed circuit television and language laboratories, and new approaches to the school curriculum, are inevitably going to change the relationship between the inspector and the teacher. As learning becomes more individualised, the teacher will move from the centre of the classroom 'stage' as the emphasis swings from teaching to learning.

A new set of variations on the inspector's role is emerging, including advisory teachers, teachers' centre-warden and curriculum leaders of the Schools Council. Again, it is clear that the effectiveness of such roles is dependent upon their integration with other inspectoral roles.

The changing interpretation of the inspector's function has exposed a central conflict right at the root of the inspector's role. He is now called upon to act as the teacher's adviser, yet he must still inspect. Can these functions really be successfully combined in one person? Can a teacher really meet as an equal one who in certain important respects has power over him?

In Middleham, some inspectors whom the writer observed answered both questions in the negative, and some in the affirmative, and suggested that more and more it will become necessary for the two functions of guidance and inspection to be performed by different persons; some, on the other hand, maintained that one person may successfully carry through the dual role.

The empirical section of this study showed that there is a wide difference of emphasis on the importance of the problem. Value judgements on these issues are entirely out of place, but the issues themselves are certainly worthy of further study. Thus, although the problem of resolving the conflict between authority and freedom in the relations of inspectors and teachers is rightly seen to be universal, there does not appear to be any universal solution for it.

5.4 Suggestions for Further Research

The project has led to the identification of certain aspects of the inspectorial role which could profitably be researched. These come under two main headings: Survey Data about Inspectors and Statistical Data.

This project was hampered from the outset by an absence of reliable national information about inspectors. The DES should collect national data about inspectors and advisers on a regular and systematic basis. This could include advisory teachers, teachers' centre wardens, educational psychologists. One criterion for distinguishing between these groups could be their salary scales, e.g. Soulbury or Burham.

a) Teachers' Opinion of Inspectors

The major gap in present research knowledge about inspectors is the perception of them held by head teachers and teachers. A survey of their perceptions should be carried out. Perceptions held by inspectors' role set, following or accompanying the study of teachers' opinion, and there should also be comparative study of the perceptions held by inspectors and advisers by administrators and lecturers.

b) Historical Studies

Very little research has been done on the development of inspectorial and advisory services. These could be based upon single LEAs or upon the work nationally of particular inspectors in particular subjects.

c) Training Programmes for Inspectors

The information collected in this project has prompted certain recommendations concerning training. There is a clear need to develop pilot and evaluate training materials and programmes for inspectors in the light of this report's findings and other experience. The outcomes for the inspectorial service should be valuable. Equally important could be the possible generalizability of what was learned to other training, the teacher trainer activities.

d) Evaluation of Schools

Equally urgent is a study of inspectors' work in evaluating performance and standards in schools. Here instruments should be judged on their feasibility and attempts should be made to involve teachers in a self-monitoring exercise.

e) Evaluation of Teachers

There is an urgent need for an action research study of inspectors' work in the evaluation of individual teachers. Such a study should assess rating scales in terms of their practical feasibility for inspectors, rather than just their validity and reliability.

f) School-Focus INSET

A study should be made of the role of inspectors in a variety of school-focus INSET activities.

Personal and situational variables may prevent an incumbent from enacting his role in the way he believes to be most appropriate.

Consequently, role conceptions and role performance are often discrepant. An extensive study of the actual role performance of inspectors and advisers would require extensive research resources. However, the compilation of detailed case studies of the role performance of personnel in individual schools is feasible for the individual research worker. Such cases would be a valuable supplement to the generalised picture presented by this survey.

The collection of data concerning the expectations of head teachers for the role of the inspector would enable comparisons to be made with the conceptions of inspectors and advisers, and might facilitate the clearer identification of areas of potential role conflict.

Many respondents contend that the personalities of the inspector and adviser are the most important variables in determining their role definitions. In future research designs, the incorporation of personality measures would be desirable in order to test the validity of this claim. Among the questions which might be considered are: Do inspectors and advisers display different personality characteristics? What effects do personality differences have on their effectiveness and their job satisfaction?

In some schools, the roles of the inspector and adviser depend very much on the perceived expectations of their immediate superiors: the Education Officers and the Chief Inspector. However, some empirical studies of their roles have yet to be undertaken. A detailed investigation of their roles would shed some light on the role expectations for the school inspector and adviser.

Since the expectations which a focal person perceives that members of his role-set hold may well be more important than their actual expectations, an investigation comparing actual expectations of head teachers with the inspector's perceived expectations would be valuable.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX ATEXT OF LETTER FROM EDMUND HOLMES
TO ROBERT MORANT IN 1910

"Sir,

In June, 1908 I sent a circular to all the Inspectors inquiring in general terms which of the Local Educational Authorities had Inspectors of their own, what salaries they received, what work they had to do, how they did their work, and whether the Board's Inspectors concerned found them a help or a hinderance.

Of these 123 Inspectors, 109 are men and only 14 are women. No fewer than 104 out of 123 are elementary teachers, and of the remaining nineteen not more than two or three have had the antecedents which were usually looked for in candidates for Junior Inspectorship - namely, that they had been educated first at a public school and then at Oxford or Cambridge. The difference in respect to efficiency between ex-elementary teacher Inspectors and those who have a more liberal education is very great.

Very few of our inspectors have a good word to say for local inspectors of the former type, whereas those of the latter type are, with three exceptions well spoken of, in for example, where out of nine Inspectors, only three are of the elementary teacher type. Her Majesty's Inspector is able to say their work is well done on the whole, and there certainly it is a help, whereas---and where, out of fifteen inspectors, fourteen belong to the ex-elementary teacher class. Her Majesty's Inspector says the existence of these Inspectors stereotypes and perpetuates cast iron methods, and forms an effectual bar to development and progress.

It is interesting to note that the two local Inspectors about whom our Inspectors are really enthusiastic hail, one from Winchester and Trinity, Cambridge, the other from Charterhouse and Corpus Christi, College, Oxford; men with such antecedents provided they possess the ability and culture, and are personally fitted for their work, make the best local Inspectors.

The £500 which is being spent on the one Oxford man in East Sussex is being laid out to infinitely better advantage than the £900 a year which is being spent on the three ex-elementary teacher Inspectors in Durham. Indeed the Durham Education Authority is beginning to realise that its £900 a year is being wasted, or worse than wasted, and now it is receiving full reports from the Board's Inspectors it is beginning to wonder what use it can make of the three Inspectors it appointed with such undue haste.

The counties have an advantage over the boroughs of having started with a clean sheet. It cannot, however, be said that they have made the best of their opportunity. Out of the 24 County Inspectors, no fewer than 16 are ex-elementary teachers. Apart from the fact that the elementary teachers are as a rule, uncultured and imperfectly educated, and that many, if not most, of them are creatures of tradition and routine, there are special reasons why the bulk of the local Inspectors in this country should be unequal to the discharge of their responsibilities. It is in the large towns the local authorities have inherited from the School Boards not merely a vicious system of local inspection but also a large number of vicious local Inspectors. Having regard to all these facts, we cannot wonder that local inspection as at present conducted in large towns is on the whole a hindrance rather than an aid to educational progress and we can only hope that local Chief Inspectors who are the fountain heads of a vicious officialdom, will be gradually pensioned off, and if local inspection is to be continued in their areas, their places will be filled by men of real culture and enlightenment. As compared with the ex-elementary teacher usually engaged in the hopeless task of surveying or trying to survey a wide field of action from a well-worn groove, the Inspector of Public Schools of the Varsity type has the advantage of being able to look at elementary education from a point of view of complete detachment, and therefore of being able to handle its problems with freshness and originality."

APPENDIX B

'MIDDLEHAM' : A PROFILE

As already stated in Chapter Five, (5.1), Middleham is the false name of a real LEA borough in the Greater London area. Greater London is made up of two parts: Outer London and Inner London. Middleham is one of the boroughs in Outer London. A brief note on its characteristics is made in this appendix.

POPULATION

The 1981 Census showed that the population present on census night in Middleham was 316,306, in Outer London was 4,182,968, and in Inner London was 2,425,630.

In Middleham 13.6 per cent of the resident population was born outside, 14.6 per cent in Outer London, and 24.3 per cent in Inner London. The highest percentage for any borough being 37.2 per cent in Brent and the lowest 4.2% in Havering. Some 11.7 per cent of the population of Outer London lived in households whose head was born in the new commonwealth or Pakistan. The highest percentage for any borough being 33.0 per cent in Brent and the lowest 2.4 per cent in Havering.

Men and Women at Work

In Outer London 84.0 per cent of men aged 16 and under 65 were in employment (full-time or part-time). A further 7.3 per cent were out of employment, that is, seeking work or prevented by temporary sickness from seeking work. The remaining 8.8 per cent were economically inactive and of these, 6.0 per cent were full-time students; 60.7 per cent of women aged 16 and under 60 years were in employment (full-time and part-time) in 1981.

Owner Occupiers and Tenants

The 1981 Census showed that 61.9% of households in Outer London were in owner-occupied accommodation and 23.2% in accommodation rented from local authorities.

*Reference

Census, 1981

County Report, Greater London, Part 1, London, HMSO, 1981.

POPULATION 1981

	<u>'Middleham'</u>	<u>Outer London</u>	<u>Inner London</u>
U.K. Birth	13.6%	14.6%	24.3%
U.K. Birth	273,304	3,570,165	1,835,411
Non-U.K. Birth	43,002	612,803	590,219
TOTAL	316,306	4,182,968	2,425,630

Social Class of Economically Active Heads of Household:

	<u>Middleham</u>	<u>O. London</u>	<u>Inner London</u>
<u>Social Class</u>			
Professional etc. occupations	6%	5%	4%
Intermediate occupations	22%	20%	17%
Skilled occupation non-manual	15%	13%	13%
Skilled occupation manual	18%	19%	17%
Partly-skilled occupation	6%	9%	13%
Unskilled occupation	1%	3%	6%

Reference:

Census, 1981

County Report, Greater London, Part 2: London, HMSO.

THE STRUCTURE OF EDUCATION

TABLE A1/1986

MAIN CATEGORIES OF SCHOOL

1.. Schools covered by the statistics in the table may be divided administratively and financially into the following broad categories:

i) Schools maintained by the local education authorities. The authorities meet their expenditure partly from local rates and partly from general grants made by the Department of the Environment. Maintained primary and secondary schools are of two kinds; county schools which have been established by voluntary bodies, (mainly religious denominations).

ii) Direct Grant Schools. The governing bodies of these schools are assisted by departmental grants, and a proportion of the pupils attending them do so free or under an arrangement by which local education authorities meet tuition fees.

MAIN TYPES OF SCHOOL

Primary schools consist mainly of infants' schools for children aged 5 to 7; in Middleham there were thirty infant schools in 1986. Full-time pupils were: Boys 3,237, Girls were 2,965. Total number of pupils in infant schools were 6,202. Full-time qualified teachers in Infant Schools were: Men 1, Women 264. — Total 265.

Junior schools for those aged 7 to 11 and Junior and Infants for both age groups. In Middleham there were 40 Junior and Infant Schools, Full-time pupils boys 5,388 - girls 5,173. Total 10,561. Full-time teachers - men 74, women 356. Total 430.

In Middleham, there were 31 Junior schools with 3,651 boys and 3,386 girls - total 7,037 pupils. Qualified teachers in the junior schools - men 88, women 229; total 317. Primary - total number of schools was 101, total number of boys 12,276, girls 11,524, total boys and girls 23,800. Full-time teachers - men 163; women 849 - total 1,012.

SECONDARY SCHOOLS

Secondary education is provided mainly in the comprehensive schools (Sixth form colleges are included in the statistics January 1986 as comprehensive schools. A school is classified as comprehensive when its admission arrangements are without reference to ability and aptitude.

In Middleham there were 29 comprehensive schools (including 6th Form Colleges) in January 1986. Full-time pupils were boys: 9,886, girls: 9,588; total: 19,474. Full-time teachers; men: 594; women: 593; total: 1,187. Total Primary Schools and Comprehensive Schools: 130; boys: 22,162; girls: 21,112; total: 43,274. Full-time teachers: men: 594; women: 593; total: 1,187.

Table A1/86: Maintained Primary and Comprehensive Schools(A) Schools, Pupils and Teachers in each LEA - January, 1986.306 Croydon or 'Middleham'.

<u>School Type</u>	<u>No. of Schools</u>	<u>Full-time Pupils</u>			<u>Full-time Teachers</u>		
		<u>Boys</u>	<u>Girls</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Men</u>	<u>Women</u>	<u>Total</u>
Primary							
Infant	30	3,237	2,965	6,202	1	264	265
Junior & Infant	40	5,388	5,173	10,561	74	356	430
Junior	31	3,651	3,386	7,037	88	229	317
<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>101</u>	<u>12,276</u>	<u>11,524</u>	<u>23,800</u>	<u>163</u>	<u>849</u>	<u>1,012</u>
Compreh. Schs.	29	9,886	9,588	19,474	594	593	1,187
<u>TOTAL P.C. Schs.</u>	<u>130</u>	<u>22,162</u>	<u>21,112</u>	<u>43,274</u>	<u>757</u>	<u>1,442</u>	<u>2,199</u>

Reference: DES: Statistics of Education - Schools - 1986,
London, HMSO.

APPENDIX C1. QUESTIONNAIREPERSONAL AND SCHOOL BACKGROUND DATAINSTRUCTIONS:

Please answer the following questions by selecting one answer which best specifies your choice.

SEX

(male/female)

AGE

(below 30 yrs/30-39/40-49/50-59/over 59)

MARITAL STATUS

(single/married/divorced/widowed)

HIGHEST ACADEMIC DEGREE

(certificate/bachelor's/master's/doctorate)

HIGHEST PROFESSIONAL DEGREE

(Dip.Ed./M.Ed./Ph.D./others)

TYPE OF INSTITUTION

(primary school/secondary school/college)

COMMENTS:

The aim in this section is to explore the School Inspector's perception of time spent on some activities of his role. A list of statements below deals with these activities. For each statement, please answer Question 1.

Question 1: How much time do you actually spend, and would you prefer to spend, on each of the tasks listed in the statements below?

In answering the question, please write down in the space provided the one letter which most appropriately represents your choice for each statement:

Response Choices

- A = a large amount of time
 B = a fair amount of time
 C = a small amount of time
 D = none at all
 E = don't know

Item	List of Statements	Actual amount of time	Preferred amount of time
1	Advising or participating in the appointment of staff to schools		
2	Advising individual staff about personal or professional matters		
3	Evaluation and career development of individual staff		
4	Formal inspection of schools		
5	Informal inspection of schools		
6	Visiting schools to diagnose their problems and needs		
7	Visiting schools to discuss the problems and needs which they have diagnosed and to indicate their solution		
8	In-service education and training		
9	Curriculum development		
10	Advising the Education Committee on policy changes in schools		
11	Advising schools on policy changes made by Education Committee		
12	Attending inspectors' meetings		
13	Attending Education Committee meetings		
14	Advising individual head teachers		
15	Observing teachers in their classes		
16	Advising individual teachers		
17	Disseminating the best practices from one school to another		
18	Report writing		
19	Dealing with correspondence		
20	Advising on the design, furnishing and equipping of schools		
21	Working contact with Teachers' Centre staff		
22	Contact with HM Inspectors		

COMMENTS:

INSTRUCTIONS

The aim in this section is to explore the School Inspector's perception of time spent on some activities of his role. A list of statements below deals with these activities. For each statement, please answer Question 1.

Question 1: How much time do you actually spend, and would you prefer to spend, on each of the tasks listed in the statements below?

In answering the question, please write down in the space provided the one letter which most appropriately represents your choice for each statement:

Response Choices

- A = a large amount of time
 B = a fair amount of time
 C = a small amount of time
 D = none at all
 E = don't know

Item	List of Statements	Actual amount of time	Preferred amount of time
1	Advising or participating in the appointment of staff to schools		
2	Advising individual staff about personal or professional matters		
3	Evaluation and career development of individual staff		
4	Formal inspection of schools		
5	Informal inspection of schools		
6	Visiting schools to diagnose their problems and needs		
7	Visiting schools to discuss the problems and needs which they have diagnosed and to indicate their solution		
8	In-service education and training		
9	Curriculum development		
10	Advising the Education Committee on policy changes in schools		
11	Advising schools on policy changes made by Education Committee		
12	Attending inspectors' meetings		
13	Attending Education Committee meetings		
14	Advising individual head teachers		
15	Observing teachers in their classes		
16	Advising individual teachers		
17	Disseminating the best practices from one school to another		
18	Report writing		
19	Dealing with correspondence		
20	Advising on the design, furnishing and equipping of schools		
21	Working contact with Teachers' Centre staff		
22	Contact with HM Inspectors		

A TABLE OF RESPONSE RATES

1	1.133333	21.0000	2.00000	13.0000
2	2.20000	2.0000	2.53333	7.5000
3	1.73333	10.0000	2.60000	5.0000
4	1.20000	18.5000	2.00000	13.0000
5	2.00000	4.0000	2.73333	2.5000
6	1.40000	13.5000	2.26667	9.0000
7	1.86667	7.0000	2.60000	5.0000
8	1.80000	9.0000	2.00000	13.0000
9	1.86667	7.0000	2.73333	2.5000
10	1.20000	18.5000	1.80000	17.0000
11	1.66667	11.5000	2.13333	10.0000
12	1.86667	7.0000	2.60000	5.0000
13	1.66667	11.5000	1.40000	18.0000
14	1.40000	13.5000	1.86667	16.0000
15	1.26667	16.0000	2.06667	11.0000
16	1.20000	18.5000	2.53333	7.5000
17	2.00000	4.0000	2.86667	1.0000
18	2.00000	4.0000	1.20000	19.0000
19	2.53333	1.0000	1.00000	21.0000
20	1.20000	18.5000	1.00000	21.0000
21	1.33333	15.0000	1.93333	15.0000
22	1.00000	22.0000	1.00000	21.0000

Mean
Rating

3 = A
2 = B
1 = C

Rank

1 = most
important
22 = least
important

Mean
Rating

3 = A
2 = B
1 = C

Rank

1 = most
important
22 = least
important

ACTUAL TIME

PREFERRED TIME

COLUMN COUNT ROW	C1 22	C2 22	C3 22	C4 22
1	21.0000	13.0000	1.13333	2.00000
2	2.0000	7.5000	2.20000	2.53333
3	10.0000	5.0000	1.73333	2.60000
4	18.5000	13.0000	1.20000	2.00000
5	4.0000	2.5000	2.00000	2.73333
6	13.5000	9.0000	1.40000	2.26667
7	7.0000	5.0000	1.86667	2.60000
8	9.0000	13.0000	1.80000	2.00000
9	7.0000	2.5000	1.86667	2.73333
10	18.5000	17.0000	1.20000	1.80000
11	11.5000	10.0000	1.66667	2.13333
12	7.0000	5.0000	1.86667	2.60000
13	11.5000	18.0000	1.66667	1.40000
14	13.5000	16.0000	1.40000	1.86667
15	16.0000	11.0000	1.26667	2.06667
16	18.5000	7.5000	1.20000	2.53333
17	4.0000	1.0000	2.00000	2.86667
18	4.0000	19.0000	2.00000	1.20000
19	1.0000	21.0000	2.53333	1.00000
20	18.5000	21.0000	1.20000	1.00000
21	15.0000	15.0000	1.33333	1.93333
22	22.0000	21.0000	1.00000	1.00000

C1 = Ranking of importance of actual time
1 = most important

C2 = Ranking of importance of preferred time
2 = least important

C3 = Average rating of actual time
1 = lowest

C4 = Average rating of preferred time
3 = highest

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ABBOTT, E. and Campbell, L., The Life and Letters of Benjamin Jowett, London, 1897.

ADAM, J.W. (ed) Educational Movements and Methods, Harrap, 1924.

ADAMS, F., History of Elementary School Context in England, Chapman and Hall, 1882.

ADAMSON, J.W., A Short History of Education, Cambridge University Press, 1922.

ALBERT, T., "Power without responsibility", Times Educational Supplement, 12 November, 1976, p.22.

ALISON, W.P., "On vital affinity", Transactions of the Royal Society, Edinburgh, XVI.

ALISON, W.P., "Illustrations of the practical operations of the Scottish system of management of the poor", Journal of London Statistical Society, III, 1840, pp.211-257.

ALLEN, B.M., Sir Robert Morant, Macmillan, 1934.

ALLEN, G.C., "HM Inspector of Schools, a personal impression", International Review of Education, Vol.6, 1960, pp.235-9.

ANDERSON, N.V., New Advisers' Course at Dyffryn, NAIEA Journal, 1.3.1975, p.14.

ARGYRIS, C., "Diagnosing defences against the outsider", Journal of the Social Issues, 8(3), 1951, pp.24-34.

- ASSOCIATION OF HM Inspectors of Schools' Memorandum, submitted by the Association, 1 July 1954 to the Royal Commission on the Civil Service, HMSO, 1954.
- AULD, R., William Tyndale Junior and Infant Schools Public Inquiry, Inner London Education Authority, 1976.
- BABCHUCK, N., "The role of the researcher as participant observer in the field situation", Human Organisation, 21(3), 1962, pp.225-8.
- BAIN, R.K., "The researcher's role, a case study", Human Organisation, 9(1), 1950, pp.23-8.
- BAINES, E., Letters to Lord John Russell on State of Education, London, 1847.
- BALL, N., Her Majesty's Inspectorate 1839-89, Oliver and Boyd, Birmingham University Press.
- BALL, N., Voluntary Efforts in English Elementary Schools, PhD Thesis, Keele University, 1970.
- BANKS, O., Party and Prestige in English Secondary Education, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1955.
- BARNARD, H.C., A Short History of English Education 1760-1944. University of London Press, 1947.
- BARTLETT, F.C., Lindgreen (ed), The Study of Society, Kegan Paul, London, 1939.
- BECKER, H.S., "A note on interviewing tactics", Human Organisation, 12(4), 1954, pp.31-2.

- BECKER, H.S., "Interviewing medical students", Americal Journal of Sociology, 62, 1956, pp.199-201.
- BECKER, H.S., Problems of Interference and Proof in Participant Observation, 1958.
- BECKER, H.S., and Blanche, G., "Participant observation and interviewing, a comparison", Human Organisation, 16(3), 1957, pp.28-32.
- BEDDIS, R., "Arms open to welcome advice and advisers", Times Educational Supplement, 13.12.74.
- BELLAIRS, H.W., The Teacher's Mission and Reward, London, 1855.
- BENNETT, J.W., "The study of culture: a survey of techniques and methods in field work", American Sociological Review, 13, 1948, pp.672-89.
- BINNS, H.B., A Century of Education 1808-1908, Dent, J.M., 1908.
- BIRCHENOUGH, C., History of Elementary Education in England and Wales, London, 1938.
- BIRCHENOUGH, M., 'The Authority's Inspectorate: the present position and future developments', Appendix to the Education Committee Agenda, London: ILEA, 1976.
- BIRKS, T.S., The Revised Code: What would it do and what would be done with it: In a letter to Earl Granville, K.G., 1862.
- BISHOP, A.S., "Ralph Lingens, Secretary to the Education Department 1849-70", British Journal of Educational Studies, Vol.XVI, No.2, June 1968, pp.138-63.

BISHOP, A.S., The Rise of a Central Authority for English Education, Cambridge University Press, 1971.

BLACKIE, J., Inspecting and the Inspectorate, London, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1970.

BLANCHE, J., Inspecting and the Inspectorate, London, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1970.

BLOOMFIELD, B.C. (ed), On the Punishment of Pauper Children in Work-houses, London, 1961.

BOARD OF EDUCATION, Grants in Aid of the Organisation and Supervision of Physical Training in Public Elementary Schools, Circular 976, 10.2.1917.

BOARD OF EDUCATION, Report of the Board of Education for the Years 1917-1918, 1919.

BOARD OF EDUCATION, Annual Report of the Chief Medical Officer of the Board of Education, The Health of the Children, 1920.

BOARD OF EDUCATION, Memorandum on the Employment by Local Education Authority of Local Officers for Inspection of Schools, HMSO, 1923.

BOLAM, R., Induction Programme for Probationary Teachers, University of Bristol, 1973.

BOLAM, R., Planned Educational Change Theory and Practice, Bristol University, School of Education, 1974.

BOLAM, R., The Management of Educational Change: Towards a Conceptual Framework, 1975.

BOLAM, R., Smith, G., and Canter, H., Local Education Authority Advisers and the Mechanisms of Innovation, Bristol University School of Education, Bristol, NFER Co. Ltd., 1979.

BOOTHROYD, H.E., History of the Inspectorate, privately printed for the Inspectorate Association, 1923.

BOYLE, E., and Crossland, A., The Politics of Education, Penguin, 1971.

BRIGGS, A., The Age of Improvement, Longmans, 1959.

BROMBY, C.H., The Revised Code: A letter to the Rt.Hon.Earl Granville, London, 1861.

BROWN, C.K.F., The Church's Part in Education 1833-1941, National Society, 1942.

BRUYN, S.T., The Human Perspective in Sociology: The Methodology of Participant Observation, Englewood Cliffs, Prentice Hall, 1966.

BURROWS, L.J., The Middle School - High Road or Dead-end, Kloburn Press, 1978.

BUTTERWORTH, H., The Science and Arts Department 1853-1900, PhD Thesis, Sheffield University.

CHANCE, W., Children under the Poor Law, 1897.

CHARLES, R.H. (ed), Inspection and Advice: Central and Local Partnership in Education, Handbook No.3, Jarrold, 1948.

CHESTER, H., Proper Limits of the State's Interference in Education, London, 1861.

CHESTER, H., Hints on the Building and Management of Schools, Chapman and Hall, 1860.

CHRISTIAN, G.A., English Education from Within, Wallace Grandy, 1922.

CLARK, The Making of Victorian England, Methuen, 1962.

CLARK, G.K., An Expanding Society, Britain 18300-1900, Cambridge University Press, 1967.

CLARK, L., The Inspector Remembers, Dobson Books, London, 1976.

CLOSE, F., Co-operation with the Committee of Council of Education, Vindicated and Recommended, 1848.

COGAN, M., Clinical Supervision, London, 1973.

COLERIDGE, D., The Education of the Pupil, London, 1861.

COLERIDGE, D., The Teachers of the People, London, 1862.

COX, C.B., and Dyson, A.E. (eds), Fight for Education. A Black Paper. London Critical Quarterly Society, 1969.

DAVIES, J.L., "Management by Objectives in Local Education Authority", Educational Administration Bulletin, 2.1.1973.

DEAN, J.P., and White, W.F., "How do they know if the Informant is telling the Truth?", Human Organisation, 17(2), 1958, pp.34-8.

DEAN, J., "The Advisory Team Introduction", NAIEA Journal, 1(3), 1975(a), pp.5-7.

DEAN, J., Training Advisers, NAIEA, 1975(b).

DEAN, J., "The Chief Advisers' Conference", NAIEA Journal, 1(3), 1975(c), pp.16-17.

DENISON, G.A., Church, Education and the Problem of Management, Clause, London, 1847.

DENISON, G.A., Church Schools and State Interference: A Letter to William Gladstone, London, 1849.

DES, HMI Today and Tomorrow, HMSO, 1970.

DES, Role of Inspectorate, England and Wales, Discussion Paper, 1974.

DES, The Supply of Teachers, Report on Education No.78, 7.7.1973.

DES, Statistics in Education, Vol.4, Teachers, HMSO, 1973.

DES, Study of Her Majesty's Inspectorate in England and Wales (The Rayner Report), London, HMSO, 1982-83.

DES, Statistics of Education - Schools, London: HMSO, 1986.

DUNFORD, J.E., Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Schools in England and Wales, 1860-1870. Monograph No.9, University of Leeds, 1980.

- EAGLESHAM, E.J.R., The Foundation of the Twentieth Century, Education in England, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1953.
- EDMONDS, E.L., The School Inspector, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, 1962.
- EDUCATION, The Change of a Decade for Justice on Salaries, 6.10.1972, pp.283-4.
- EDUCATION, Head Teachers - You Cannot Have Your Cake and Eat It, 30.5.1975.
- EDUCATION, The Advisory Service, 20.2.1976.
- ELTON, E.A., Secondary Education in the East Riding of Yorkshire, 1944-1974. Educational Administration and History Monograph, No.2, University of Leeds, 1974.
- ENGLISH, C., HM Inspectorate, DES Report on Education, June 1976, No.37.
- ERAUT, M., In-Service Education for Innovation, London, 1972.
- EVANS, K., The Development and Structure of the English Educational System, Hodder and Stoughton, 1975.
- FEARON, D.R., School Inspection, Macmillan, London, 1876.
- FISKE, D.A., The Local Inspectorate in Redcliffe-Maud's England, 1969.
- FENWICK, I.G.K., The Comprehensive School 1944-1970, Methuen, 1976.

- FISHER, P., External Examination in Secondary Schools in England and Wales 1944-1964, Educational Administration and History, Monograph No.11, University of Leeds, 1982.
- FITCH, J.T., and M. Arnold, Their Influence on English Education, 1897.
- FITZMAURICE, Lord E., The Life of Lord Granville 1815-1891, 2 vols., Longmans, 1905.
- FRASER, J., National Education. A sermon preached on 25 October 1868, Rivington.
- GENTLE, K., "The Significance of Advisory Work", NAIEA Journal, 1.4.1976, pp.15-16.
- GOLD, R.L., "Roles in Sociological Field Observations", Social Forces, 36, 1958.
- GOODWIN, F.J., The Art of Headmaster, London, Ward Locke, 1968.
- GORDON, R.L., "Dimensions of Depth Interview", American Journal of Sociology, 62, 1958, pp.158-164.
- GOSDEN, P.H.J.H., The Development of Educational Administration in England and Wales, Basil Blackwell, Oxford, 1966.
- GOSDEN, P.H.J.H., Section C: Inspection and Inspectors, in: Gosden, P.H.J.H., Educational Administration in England and Wales: A Bibliographical Guide, 1967.
- GOSDEN, P.H.J.H., Education in the Second World War: A Study in Policy and Administration, Methuen, 1976.

- GOSDEN, P.H.J.H., The Educational System Since 1944, Martin Robertson, Oxford.
- GRETTON, J., Jackson, M., and Tyndale, W., Collapse of a School - or System? Allen and Unwin, 1976.
- GRIER, L., Achievement in Education: The Work of Michael E. Sadler, 1885-1935, Constable, 1952.
- HARTLEY, O.A., "Inspectorates in British Central Government", Journal of the Royal Institute of Public Administration, Vol.50, 1972.
- HAVELOCK, R.G., Planning for Innovation through Dissemination and Utilization of Knowledge, Arbor, A., Michigan, 1969.
- HAVELOCK, R.G., and Havelock, M.C., Training for Change Agents, Arbor, A., University of Michigan, Institute for Social Research.
- HICKMAN, A., A New Professionalism for a Changing Geography, London, Schools Council, 1973.
- HILLSUM, S., and Start, R.B., Promotion and Careers in Teaching, Slough, NFER, 1974.
- HOGAN, J.M., Beyond the Classroom Reading, Educational Explorers, 1970.
- HOLMAN, H., English National Education, Blackie, 1898.
- HOLMES, B., Case Studies of Educational Innovation: 11 at the Regional Level, Paris, OECD, 1973.
- HOLMES, E., What is and What might be? Constable, 1911.

HORT, F.J.A., Thoughts on the Revised Code of Education, Its Purposes and Probable Effects, Cambridge, Macmillan, 1862.

HOWARTH, T., "Advice on advisers", Times Educational Supplement, 22.11.1974.

HOYLE, E., "Planning Organisational Change in Education", Research in Education, 3, 1970.

HUNT, J., Education in Evolution, Hart-Davies, R., London, 1971.

HURT, J.S., The Development of Elementary Education in the 19th Century: The Role of the Committee of the Privy Council, PhD Thesis, London University, 1968.

HURT, J.S., Elementary Schooling and the Working Classes 1860-1918, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1979.

HYMAN, H.H., "Do they tell the truth?", Public Opinion Quarterly, 8, 1944, pp.557-9.

ILEA, William Tyndale Junior and Infant Schools. Public Enquiry: A Report to the ILEA by Robin Auld Q.C., ILEA, 1976.

INGOLDBY, A., "Looking at Secondary Schools", NAIEA Journal, 1.4.1976, pp.7-10.

KAHN, R.L., and Floyd, M., "Developing Research Partnerships", Journal of Social Issues, 8(3), 1952, pp.4-10.

KAY-SHUTTLEWORTH, J., Four Periods of Public Education, Longmans Green, London, 1862.

KAY-SHUTTLEWORTH, J., Memorandum on Popular Education, Ridgway, 1868 (New edition, Woburn Press, 1969).

KLUCKHOHN, F., "The Participant Observation Technique in Small Communities", American Journal of Sociology, 46, 1940, pp.331-2.

KOBLEN, A.J., "New Ways of Presenting Old Ideas: The Statistical Method", Sociology, 82, 1952, pp.129-46.

KOGAN, M., The Politics of Educational Change, Fontana/Collins, 1971.

KOGAN, M. and Van der Eyken, W., County Hall LEA, Penguin, 1973.

KOGAN, M., and Packwood, T., Advisory Councils and Committees in Education, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1974.

KOGAN, M., Educational Accountability, Hutchinson, 1986.

KOLAJA, J., "Contribution to Theory of Participant Observation", Social Forces, 35, 1956, pp.159-63.

LAWRENCE, B., The Administration of Education in Britain, Batsford, 1972.

LAWTON, D., The Politics of the School Curriculum, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1980.

LAWTON, D., The Tightening Grip, University of London Institute of Education, Bedford Way, Papers 21, 1984.

LAWTON, D., and Gordon, P., HMI, London, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1987.

LEESE, J., Personalities and Power in English Education, Arnolds, Leeds, 1950.

LEESE, J., The History and Character of Educational Inspection in England, PhD Thesis, London University.

LEINSTER-MACKAY, D., Cross-Pollinators of English Education: Case Studies of Three Victorian School Inspectors in Educational Administration and History, Monograph No.16, Museum of the History of Education, University of Leeds, 1986.

LOWNDES, G.A.N., The Silent Social Revolution, Oxford University Press, 1937.

MACLURE, J.S., Educational Documents, England and Wales, 1816-1967, Chapman and Hall, 1968.

MACLURE, S., One Hundred Years of London Education: 1870-1970, Allen Lane, Penguin, 1970.

MADGE, J., The Tools of Social Science, London, Longmans, Green, 1953.

MALLABY, G., Size of Authority and Effect on Recruitment of Professional Staff, in: Committee on the Staff of Local Government, 1967.

MANN, J., "Management and Education in Local Government", Secondary Education, Vol.3, No.2, 1973.

MAUD, J., Baron Redcliffe-Maud: Experiences of an Optimist, Hamish-Hamilton, 1981.

MAUDE, R., Royal Commission on Local Government in England, Cmnd 4040, London, HMSO, 1969.

- McCALL, G.J., and Simmons, J.L., Issues in Participant Observation, Chicago, Addison-Wesley, 1969.
- McCANN, W.P., "Elementary Education", Journal of Educational Administration and History, 1969.
- MEAD, M., and Rhoda, M., The Study of Culture at a Distance, Chicago University Press, 1953.
- MURPHY, J., Church State and Schools in Britain: 1800-1970, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, 1971.
- NIBLETT, W.R., et al, The University Connection, NFER, 1975.
- OECD, Report on Britain 1976, reprinted in: Raggatt, R., (ed) The Political Context, Ward Lock, 1977.
- OFFICE OF POPULATION, Census and Surveys, Census 1981, County Report, Greater London, Part 1, London, HMSO, 1981.
- PETERS, R.S. (ed), Perspectives on Plowden, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1969.
- POTTER, F.F., Educational Journey: Memories of Fifty Years in Public Education, 1949.
- RAYMONT, T., Modern Education: its Aims and Methods, Longmans Green, 1934.
- RHODES, G., Inspectorates in British Government, Allen & Unwin, 1981.
- RICH, E.E., The Education Act 1870, Longmans, London, 1927.

RICH, R.W., The Training of Teachers in England and Wales during the 19th Century, Cambridge University Press, 1933.

RICHARDS, A.I., The Development of Field Work Methods in Social Anthropology: The Study of Society, London, Kegan Paul, 1939, pp.272-316.

RICHARDSON, S.A., "Training in Field Relation Skills", Journal of Social Issues, 8, 1952, pp.43-50.

RIECKEN, H.W., "The Unidentified Interviewer", American Journal of Sociology, 62, 1956, pp.210-212.

ROBINS, S., Twenty Reasons for Accepting the Revised Educational Code, Longmans, 1862.

ROBSON, A.H., The Education of the Children in Industry in England, 1833-76, Devonshire Press, 1931.

SALTER, B., and Tapper, T., Education, Politics and the State. Grant McIntyre, 1981.

SELLECK, R.J.W., The New Education: The English Background, Pitman, 1968.

SELLMAN, R.R., Devon Schools in the Nineteenth Century, David and Charles, 1967.

SENIOR, N., Suggestions on Popular Education, 1861.

SIMON, B., Studies on the History of Education 1780-1870, Lawrence & Wishart, 1960.

SMITH, B.F., A letter to the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury on the Revised Code, Cox & Wyman, 1861.

- SMITH, F., English Elementary Education 1860-1902, University of London Press, 1931.
- SMITH, W.C.L., To Whom Do Schools Belong?, Blackwell, Oxford, 1943.
- SNEYD-KYNNERSLEY, E.M., HMI, Macmillan, London, 1908.
- SQUIRE, R.E., Thirty Years in the Public Service, Nisbet, 1927.
- STUART, M., The Education of the People, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1967.
- SUTHERLAND, G., Elementary Education in the Nineteenth Century, Historical Association, London, 1971.
- SUTHERLAND, G., Policy-making in Elementary Education 1870-95, Oxford, 1973.
- SWINBURNE, A.J., Memories of a School Inspector, privately published, 1912.
- SYLVESTER, D., Robert Lowe and Education, Cambridge University Press, 1974.
- THOMSON, D., England in the Nineteenth Century 1815-1914, Penguin, 1950.
- TREVELYAN, G.M., British History in the Nineteenth Century and After, Longmans, 1946.
- TRICE, H.M., "Outsider's Role in the Field Study", Sociology and Social Research, 41, 1956, pp.27-32.